



218

Va.



*George Washington Flowers  
Memorial Collection*

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

ESTABLISHED BY THE  
FAMILY OF  
COLONEL FLOWERS

FAITH, THE VICTORY;

OR,

A COMPREHENSIVE VIEW

OF

THE PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES

OF

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

BY

RT. REV. JOHN McGILL, D. D.

BISHOP OF RICHMOND.

“This is the *Victory*, which overcometh the World, our *Faith*.”  
1 JOHN V: 4.

“In the Catholic Church itself, very great care is to be taken that we hold that which hath been believed every where, always, and by all.”—*Commonitorium of Vincent of Lirin*s.

RICHMOND:

J. W. RANDOLPH, 121 MAIN STREET.

1865.

---

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1865, by Rt.  
Rev. JOHN MCGILL, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court  
of the Confederate States of America, for the Eastern Dis-  
trict of Virginia.

---

---

Macfarlane & Fergusson, Printers.



T. R.

~~250~~

~~MI 5 F~~

cont  
# 31

## DEDICATION.

We presume to dedicate to our Father in Christ, His Holiness Pope PIUS IX., this little volume, as an affectionate token of admiration of his eminent talents, exalted virtues, and benevolent character, and of humble submission to his supreme authority, as visible head of the Church, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

THE AUTHOR.



## P R E F A C E.

---

The actual condition of the country, because of the deplorable and sanguinary war now waged, and of the blockade which is enforced, prevents us from procuring the many excellent works, which have been written and published elsewhere, for explaining and defending the doctrines of religion. Yet it is not only desirable, but even most necessary, that we should have some books of religious instruction for our people, and especially for the youth of both sexes, who, either in the schools, or under the paternal roof, are at present receiving their education. Moreover, among those not of our church, there appears to be a growing disposition to become acquainted with Catholic doctrines, and to examine for themselves into the nature and grounds of our faith, and it is difficult for them to obtain the necessary books, or for the priests, from whom they are asked, to furnish them. As in other cases, when men cannot obtain what is deemed necessary or very important, they exert themselves to prepare a suitable substitute which may answer, I have been induced, in view of our manifest need, to write and publish this volume, notwithstanding the difficulties attending such an enterprise in our present circumstances. I entertain the hope that my Right Reverend and Reverend Brethren of the Clergy, to whose enlightened criticism I submit it, being prepared to receive and profit by their suggestions,

will not find it unworthy of their approbation and patronage, and that both for members of the church, and for candid and ingenuous readers of other denominations, it will not be without interest and utility, even though they may have access to the standard works, which give expositions of the various points of our doctrines. Many of these are in the catechetical form, not the most pleasing to some minds, and which I have not adopted, though I recognize and appreciate its advantages. I have also aimed to condense as much as I have been able, without a sacrifice of perspicuity, in order to present a general view of our principal tenets in a small volume. I must, however, admonish the reader, that it was more my purpose to set before him a plain statement of the principal doctrines of religion, than to bring forward the various proofs from the Holy Scriptures and from the testimonies of early Fathers and Doctors, which might be adduced, and which manifest that they are divine revelations and Apostolical traditions. I desired to show what is taught by the church, and what we have to receive with faith, giving on different points some of the proofs, but not to exhibit and controvert the various errors and objections, at different times, devised by the pride of human reason, in scrutinizing the mysteries of God, and the claims of his church.

From the text of St. John, on the title page, will be perceived the reason why I call this book, "FAITH, THE VICTORY." The greatest victory, that man can achieve, is that by which he conquers his own passions, and thus foils all his enemies, "the world, the flesh, and the devil," and merits the crown of glory and everlasting life. "To him who shall overcome, I will give to

sit with me in my throne, as I also have overcome, and am set down with my Father, in his throne." Apoc. iii. 21. But this victory, over self and over our spiritual enemies, can only be obtained by faith, which hears, believes, and obeys God. "An obedient man shall speak of victory." Prov. xxi. 28. When God reveals any thing, our duty is to believe and obey him. To begin to reason about what he has revealed is to act unreasonably. We should use our reason to examine if God has spoken, but not to inquire whether what he says is credible. The reason of God is infinitely superior to our reason, and he can reveal to us things above our comprehension. We can only know what God has said, in the sense he has said it, from his church. It is therefore only by "hearing the church," that we can have faith, which will enable us to overcome ourselves, and secure salvation.

Many, who have come into life to receive immediately the blessing of the true faith by baptism, being born of Catholic parents, and having the opportunity to be instructed, lose the victory because of their ignorance of the principles and reasons of their faith. They neglect to study the motives of credibility, to understand exactly what the church has defined, and to ascertain upon what grounds and proofs she rests her teaching, and when their faith is misrepresented and denounced as absurd, they know not what to reply, become ashamed of what should be their glory, and therefore they fall away in time of temptation. Had they been equally ignorant on all other matters, they might have been secure in the humility which confides in the authority of the church, and asks only to know what it is necessary to believe and do in order to secure eternal life.

But thinking themselves wise, they imagine that they should be able to defend all they should profess, without having, by study and reading, acquired the necessary science, which would qualify them to know precisely what the doctrines are, and to detect the misrepresentations and sophisms by which they are impugned.

But it is almost impossible to induce men to interest themselves about that which is most important to them, their eternal destiny, and the means to ensure their happiness forever. Either they are unwilling to submit their minds in obedience to faith, or unwilling, when they do believe, to "deny themselves and carry the cross," as Jesus Christ requires to be done by those who would follow him to his glory.

As I have undertaken to treat of those doctrines, upon which depend the destinies of men for eternity, and where it is of the utmost importance to present only what is true, it is a duty and satisfaction to submit the whole, to the judgment of the Holy See, whose authority is supreme, and I do this with the ready will, to expunge any thing which it may find herein not consistent with Divine revelation and Catholic doctrine. I have, however, been as careful as I could be, to present as pertaining to faith, only that which is certainly revealed in the Word of God, and believed in the church. With this declaration, and noting that the last chapter is less complete than those preceding, because I had to condense three that were prepared, in order to avoid increased cost, I leave the book to the considerate attention and impartial judgment of the reader.

RICHMOND, FEBRUARY, 1865.



PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

---

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.—THE NATURE OF GOD.—  
THE UNITY OF GOD.—THE TRINITY.

“*The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God;*”\* but this denial springs up in the heart from a corrupt will, and is never the conclusion of the *mind*. The denial of the existence of God cannot in any sane mind find place, since in addition to the intimate sense of God’s existence, which every one has, there are irresistible proofs, adduced from the principles of metaphysics, and from the experience of a Supreme Providence overruling the world and human affairs, superadded to the express revelation which the Deity has made of himself, that establishes the fact beyond all doubt.

There never was a nation that did not worship some God; for as the Psalmist declares: “*The light of thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us.*” † The wonderful order of the different parts of the universe manifestly declares the supreme architect. For as Cicero says: “No art, no hand, no workman can, by imitating attain the dexterity and skill found in nature.” ‡ Even the human body itself, with its wonderful conformation, and its co-ordination of so many delicate parts, proclaims its divine Maker. “The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of his

---

\* Ps. xiii. 1. † Ps. iv. 7 ‡ De Nat. Deor. lib. 2.

hands,"\* says the Royal Prophet; and we read in wisdom: "For by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby." †

### *The Nature of God.*

No words can more fitly express to our minds the divine nature, than those which Moses represents that he received from God himself: "I AM WHO AM." These words indicate a being, self-existing, depending upon no other being, and upon whom all other beings are dependent; and whatever perfection can be thought or imagined must belong to this being, self-existent, independent, and therefore infinite. To exist of himself, dependent upon no other, is to be eternal, infinite, and to have all possible perfections.

God, being supremely perfect, is therefore a pure spirit, most simple in his nature, eternal, immense, immutable, knowing all things, omnipotent, and ruling all things. God is a pure spirit, and has not those things which are perceived by the human senses. He is simple, or without parts, and, having neither commencement nor ending, exists always the same. Eternity is defined by Boetius: "The entire and perfect possession of interminable life." ‡ In God there is no before and afterwards, no succession, or distinction of past and future, but the plenitude of life. He is immense, because circumscribed neither by place nor time, he exists everywhere, and fills all things. He is not subject to vicissitude or change, and all things are present to him, and he sees the past and the future at the same glance. There is nothing which involves power, that lies not within the reach of his omnipotence; and if there be any thing he cannot do, it is only such things as involve imbecility, weakness, imperfection, or deficiency in the

---

\*Ps. xviii: 2. †Wisdom, ch. xiii: 5. ‡Boetius lib., 3, de consolatione.

one who should do them. All things else depend on him, because he created, preserves, and governs them according to his own supreme will and pleasure. The Psalmist says: "He spoke and they were made; He commanded, and they were created."\* "When Thou openest thy hand, they shall all be filled with good. But if Thou turn away thy face, they shall be troubled: Thou shalt take away their breath and they shall fail, and shall return to the dust."†

### *Of the Unity of God.*

God is one. "If God is not one, there is no God," says Tertullian. Indeed the supreme, absolute, and infinite could not be found in two or more beings. The absolutely perfect and infinite admits of nothing equal to it. For supreme perfection is to have no equal. When the pagans worshipped many gods, they were subjected to gross blindness of mind and obduracy of heart, and "professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things."‡ Not the common herd only, but the Philosophers and learned, because of sin, were given over to this reprobate sense; "Because that when they knew God, they have not glorified him as God, or given thanks; but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened." But even the pagans had the idea of the Supreme Deity. And they could never have supposed that those men and inferior creatures, so foolishly considered by them as gods, could be endowed with the infinite attributes and perfections, which can only be found in one being. "Hear, Oh Israel, the Lord our God is *one* God;"§ and again: "See ye that I alone am, and there is no other God besides me."||

---

\*Ps. cxlviii: 5. †Ps. ciii: 28, 29. ‡Rom. 1: 22, 23. §Deut. vi: 4. ||Ib. xxxii: 39.

*The Most Holy Trinity.*

God, though one in his divine being and nature, exists in a trinity of persons. This article of divine faith is a sublime mystery, which we are not bound to comprehend, but to believe. "Teach all nations, baptizing them in the *name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."\* The Constantinopolitan creed says: "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and yet these are not three Gods, but only one God." And "These three are one," says the Apostle St. John.† It follows from God's revelation that this is true, even though we may not comprehend it. Our reason is not able to comprehend the infinite. But our reason tells us, that the infinitely perfect being cannot teach us a falsehood. If we were required to believe that God is one and three under the same respects, it might seem to us absurd, but we are taught that God is one in respect to his being and essence, but three under the respect of personality only—"one God in three persons." And if God tells us this is so, we can only say: I do not comprehend how it is so; but we cannot say, I do not believe it. Because God is worthy to be believed, and we ought "to bring into captivity our understanding unto the obedience of Christ."‡ The mystery requires us to believe that all the divine attributes, eternity, majesty, omnipotence, omniscience, and all absolute perfections belong equally to each of these three divine persons, because they are all one God, and one God only.

The Father is the fountain and origin of the others, himself produced from no other, and called Father, because from eternity and always, He generates the Son consubstantial with himself—that is, of the same substance with Him. "God of God, light of light, true God of true God."§

The Son is begotten of the Father from all eternity,

---

\*Math. xxviii: 23. †1 John v: 7. ‡2 Cor. x: §Nicene Creed.



generated, not made, and is called *the Word*, the *wisdom* of the Father. The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one principle, but He is not generated. He is a person, and the term of the mutual love which the Father and the Son have for each other.

In contemplating this mystery, we should not allow our imagination to seize upon it, as if we could picture it to ourselves. We cannot imagine that this generation and procession require priority, because in God there is no succession of time, but the generation and procession are always, as God exists always from eternity to eternity. To help us slightly to understand this, we may consider how light proceeds from the sun, and yet both are of the same antiquity of time. But God exists in Eternity, and the three divine persons have the same antiquity, notwithstanding the generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Ghost. We believe this, because it is the revelation which God has made to us concerning himself. While the human mind cannot comprehend this mystery, yet having known it by revelation, it sometimes makes an effort to show, from the image thereof found in man, that it must of necessity be found in God. Of this we have an example in the Sixth Elevation of Bossuet, on the mystery of the Trinity. He writes: "We exist, we understand, we will. Now, to understand and to will is not absolutely the same thing; were it absolutely the same thing, persons would not distinguish them. But they do distinguish them: for we understand what we do not will, what we do not love, although we cannot love or will what we do not understand. God understands and knows what he does not love—as for example, sin; and how many things do we understand and hate, and which we would neither do nor suffer, because we understand that they are hurtful to us?"

"We are therefore something intelligent, something which understands itself and loves itself; which loves only what it understands, but which can know and understand what it does not love. Thus to understand

and to love are distinct things, but so *inseparable*, that there is no knowledge without some will. And if man, like the angel, knew all that he is, his knowledge would be equal to his being: and loving himself in proportion to his knowledge, his love would be equal to the one and the other. And if the whole of this were well ordered, the whole together would constitute but one and the same happiness of the same soul, and, to speak truly, of the same happy soul; in this, that by the uprightness of its will, conformed to the truth of its knowledge, it would be just. Thus, these three things well ordered, *to be, to know, and to will*, make one only happy and just soul, which could not *be* without being *known*, nor *be known* without being *loved*, nor separate from itself one of these things, without losing the whole entirely, and with the whole its happiness. For what would it import to a soul to be, and yet not know itself? or to know itself, and not to love itself in the manner it should to be truly happy—that is, without loving itself in reference to God, who is the whole foundation of our happiness.”

“Thus, in our imperfect and defective manner, do we present the image of an incomprehensible mystery. A created Trinity, which God has placed in our souls, represents to us the uncreated Trinity, which He only could reveal to us; and to make us represent it the better, he has mingled in our souls, which represent it, something of the incomprehensible. We have seen that to understand and to will, to know and to love, are acts very distinct from each other; but are they so distinct that they are entirely and substantially different? This cannot be: the knowledge is nothing else than our soul affected in a certain way; and the will, but the substance of our soul, affected in another way. When I change either thought or will, have I this thought or will without my substance entering therein? Undoubtedly it enters; and at bottom it is nothing else than my substance affected, diversified, modified in different ways, but in its base always the same. For in changing thought, I do not change substance; and my sub-



stance remains one, whilst my thoughts come and go, and whilst my will goes on distinguishing itself in my soul, whence it continues to proceed; just as my knowledge goes on distinguishing itself from my being, from which likewise it proceeds, and whilst both, viz: my knowledge and my will, in so many manners distinguish themselves, and successively direct themselves to diverse objects, my *substance ever remains the same at bottom*, although it enters entirely into all these manners of being, *so different from each other.*”

“O God! In whose presence I contemplate myself, and to myself am an enigma! I have seen in myself three things: to be, to understand, to will. Thou dost will that I should forever be, since thou hast given to me an immortal soul, the happiness or woe of which shall be eternal; and didst *Thou* will it, I should understand and will always the same thing; for it is thus thou willest that I may be forever, when thou shalt make me happy by thy presence. Did I will and understand but the same thing, as I have but one only being, I should also have but one only knowledge and will, or, if the expression be preferred, one only *to understand* and *to will*. However, my knowledge and my love or my will would not for this be less distinguished from each other, nor less identified—that is to say, would not be the less one with the basis of my being, with my substance. And my love or my will could not but proceed from my knowledge; and my love would be always a thing which I should produce within myself, nor should I the less produce my knowledge; and there would always be in me three things, being, or *to be*, producing knowledge, knowledge produced, and also love produced by the one and the other. *And if I were of a nature incapable of all accidents occurring to its substance, and in which everything must of necessity be substantial, my knowledge and my love would be something substantial and subsistent; and I should be three subsisting persons in one only substance—that is, I should be God.*”

“But as things are not thus with me, I am only made

to the image and likeness of God, and an imperfect sketch of that unique substance, which is at *the same* time Father, Son and Holy Ghost; a substance which is incomprehensible in its triune divinity, at bottom but one same thing, sovereign, immense, eternal, perfectly one, in three distinctly subsisting persons, equal to each other, consubstantial; to whom is due one only worship, one only adoration, one only love."

The length of this citation will be forgiven us, on account of its beauty, and even sublimity. Bossuet considers the soul a *created trinity*, and avers that were it *infinite*, its three faculties or powers would be *three subsisting persons*. No accident can occur to the divine substance, infinite and eternal; and knowledge and love in God must then be something substantial, subsistent, living, and therefore *in God there must be three living subsistences* in one only *substance*—subsistences called divine persons, not in the sense of *person* applied to men, but in a sense as incomprehensible as the essence of God, which is one and indivisible, and belongs entire to each of the three persons, who are uncreated, and distinct from each other in *personality* only. We cannot comprehend this Trinity of persons, nor this unity of substance and essence; nor can we comprehend our soul, one substance and three powers, but we can believe these mysteries, because God reveals them.

---

## CHAPTER II.

OF CREATION.—OF ANGELS.—OF GOOD ANGELS.—  
OF DEMONS.

God created Heaven and Earth, and all things that they contain. These things are called the works of God.

They are the works of God, as the one first cause of all things, and the three divine persons alike in them manifested their glory and power. Yet, in considering these works, we attribute different operations to the different persons of the Holy Trinity. What flows from Omnipotence, is attributed to the Father; what from wisdom, to the Son, who is the Word and wisdom of the Father; and what from goodness and love, to the Holy Ghost. This attribution to the different persons of the Holy Trinity assists our understanding to contemplate them, and appeals to our admiration, gratitude and love. God created the heavens and the earth "in the beginning." Upon the earth he placed the first man and woman, whom also He created. But besides man, He created beings superior to men—for the Scriptures often speak to us of his angels.

#### *Of the Angels.*

At what time God created man, we are told in the Scriptures; but these do not tell us at what time precisely he created the angels. St. Epiphanius and others infer from the Scriptures, that the angels were not created after God had given existence to the stars, since it said in the book of Job: "When the morning stars praised me together, (or were made,) and all the sons of God made a joyful melody."\* Nor were they created before the heavens and the earth, since before the creation of these no created things existed, because God created these "in the beginning."

We are taught by the church, that "from the beginning, God, by His omnipotent power, created out of nothing both creatures, the spiritual and the corporeal, to wit, the angelic and the mundane, and then the human, as if common, constituted out of spirit and body."† From which declaration some infer that the angels were created before mere corporal things; which seems also to be the opinion of St. Augustine. The angels are spiritual, intellectual creatures, without bodies, as theo-

---

\* Job, ch. xxxviii: 7. † Coune. Later., ch. i: 4, an. 1215.

logians commonly teach, although no definition has been made by the church that they have no bodies.\* “Who makest thy angels spirits: and thy ministers a burning fire.”† They have the power to know and to understand in a degree far superior to man. A characteristic difference between the angel and the human soul is, that the angel of his own nature exists as spirit, while the human soul of its nature tends to a connexion with a human body. The body is its compliment, and though for a time it be separated from it by death, it is again, at the resurrection, to be re-united with it.

The number of the angels has not been made known to us, but from the Scriptures we learn that their number is very great. We also find mention made of different ranks or orders. We are told of the seraphim, cherubim, thrones, dominations, principalities, powers, the virtues of Heaven, archangels, and angels. These constitute nine choirs, and by theologians these nine choirs have been classed in three hierarchies, each consisting of three choirs. As God created the angels, that he might bestow upon them eternal felicity, we are assured that He liberally granted to them whatever was necessary to enable them to secure this happiness, which consists in knowing God as He is, in loving Him, and possessing him forever.

Of the angels, some obtained eternal felicity, and some, by their own fault, lost it. The first are called holy angels, or simply angels, the last are called devils, demons, evil spirits, the powers of darkness. In the beginning all the angels were good, their nature was good. But being intelligences, and endowed with liberty, they had to be subjected to trial. God, giving to them grace, left them to choose their lot freely. If they were faithful, and under this trial persevered in grace, their destiny was fixed in eternal happiness; but infidelity brought a loss of grace, and eternal reprobation.

---

\*Some have held the opinion that angels are invested with a sort of subtle body, rather spiritual than material; but the Psalmist, as above cited, declares: “Who makest thy angels spirits.”

†Ps. ciii: 4.

tion. Unfortunately, many of them, exalted with pride because of their own excellence, fell by sin and became demons. Wishing to be independent of God, they were consigned to everlasting misery.

Two cities being thus formed, according to St. Augustine's idea, the city of the holy angels and the city of demons, there was an eternal separation between them. But in creation nothing is isolated, and between this world and the world of spirits, there are numerous points of contact. Relations exist between men and the angels, both good and bad, as we are taught to believe by the church.

### *The good Angels in their Relations with Men.*

The sublime and acceptable office of those intelligences who remained faithful to God, and who enjoy his friendship, was shown to St. John, as he informs us in the Apocalypse: "And all the angels stood round about the throne, and the ancients, and the four living creatures; and they fell down before the throne upon their faces, and adored God saying: Amen. Benediction, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, honor, and power, and strength to our God for ever and ever. Amen!"\* But besides their presence before God, they are his messengers, as their very name of *angel* imports. They are the instruments of his providence over men. The Holy Scriptures are full of testimonies to this truth, and the church has always taught it. St. Paul asks: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent to minister for them, who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?"† The fathers speak of the angel who presided at baptism; of the angel who intervened in the oblation, and bore it up to the sublime altar, which is Jesus Christ; of the angel of prayer, who presented to God the vows of the faithful.

"The ancients," writes Bossuet, "were so affected by this ministry of the angels, that Origen publicly

---

\* Apoc. vii: 11, 12. † Heb. i: 14.



and directly invokes the angel of baptism, and recommends to him an old man, who was about to become the child of Jesus Christ by this sacrament."

"When," Bossuet continues, "when I behold in the prophets, in the Apocalypse, in the gospels themselves, that angel of the Persians, that angel of the Greeks, that angel of the Jews, (Dan. x.: 13, 20, 21; xii: 1,) the angel of little children, who undertakes their cause before God against such as scandalize them, (Mathew xviii. 10,) the angel of the waters, the angel of the fire, (Apoc. xiv: 18, xvi: 5,) and thus of others; when, among all the angels, I behold him who places the incense of prayers upon the celestial altar; (ibid. viii: 3,) I recognize in these words a kind of mediation of holy angels; I even see the grounds which gave occasion to the pagans to distribute their divinities in the elements and in kingdoms to preside over them: *for every error is founded upon some truth that is abused.* But God forbid that I should see, in all these expressions of the Scripture, any thing which injures the mediation of Jesus Christ, whom all the heavenly spirits recognize as their Lord, or anything which savours of pagan errors, since there is an infinite difference between recognizing, as did the Pagans, a God whose action cannot extend to every thing, and who needs to be aided by subalterns, after the manner of earthly kings, whose power is limited; and a God who doing all things, and able to do all things, *honours his creatures by associating them with his action when he pleases, and in the manner that he pleases.*"\*

God's omnipotence suffices for the government of the universe, but, as Bossuet says, God is pleased to honour his creatures, in bringing them to take part in his action. He does this both for men and angels; hence the consoling and beautiful doctrine of guardian angels. Of the children our Saviour assures us: "that their angels in Heaven always see the face of my Father, who is in Heaven." † If the church has not expressly de-

---

\* Preface to the Apocalypse, xxvii. † Math. xviii: 10.



fined that every one has his guardian angel, it is the common sentiment of the fathers and theologians, that the just and faithful have each a particular guardian angel to watch over them, while many of them are of opinion that the goodness of God has given such guardians to all men, even to the infidels. And when we remember how frail and weak we are, and how surrounded by perils of all kinds, as well in the physical as in the moral order, it is consoling to think that we have such a celestial auxiliary to watch over and help us. The thought is capable not only to excite our gratitude to God, but to stimulate our self-respect, as it manifests our present alliance with the celestial society, into which we hope one day to be introduced.

It is particularly with reference to our eternal salvation that this guardianship is appointed; but our interests in the temporal order are also the subject of solicitude to these generous guardians.

#### *Of the Demons in their Relations with Men.*

The demons are angels who have fallen through pride, of whom the chief is Lucifer, known commonly as the Devil. "And the angels who kept not their principality, but forsook their own habitation, He hath reserved under darkness in everlasting chains, unto the judgment of the great day."\* Their ruin was irretrievable and without hope, and their wills, fixed in malignity, burn with desire to propagate rebellion against God. They hate men as aspirants for the places they have left vacant in Heaven, and strive to bring them into a similar rebellion and ruin. Though exiled to hell, and held in the bondage of everlasting chains, as represented by St. Jude, and also by St. Peter, in the 4th verse of the second chapter of his second epistle, there are many of them permitted by God to diffuse themselves through the air, under the influence of "the prince of the power of this air, of the spirit that now

---

\*Jude 1: v. 6.

worketh on the children of unbelief,"\* seeking to ensnare men into sin for their eternal ruin. These evil spirits, as shown in the holy scriptures, chiefly act by means of temptations and possessions. That they have been allowed to take possession of the bodies of men, is clear from several places in the New Testament, and these persons were said to be "*possessed of the Devil.*" The history of the casting out of the devil by our Saviour, recorded by St. Mark in his ninth chapter, is one of the most remarkable. It is needless to specify other instances.

Of temptations, much is said to us in the Holy Scriptures. St. Peter tells us: "Be sober and watch; because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour, whom resist ye strong in faith."† And St. Paul says: "Put ye on the armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood; but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places."‡

Before the death of Jesus Christ, these wicked spirits had more power than since, but Christ overcame them by his death and resurrection. At the end of the world, and during the persecution of Antichrist, they will make greater efforts through the increased wickedness of men; but at all times they are restless in trying to seduce souls, by their deceits and snares. They can only obtain empire over Christians, by leading them into mortal sin. But Christians must be proved by temptations, and God permits them to be tried. The Apostle, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, shows what is the nature of this trial by temptations: "Let no temptation take hold on you, but such as is human. And God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able; but will make also with

---

\*Ephes., c. 2: v. 2. †1 Pet., ch. 5: v. 8, 9. ‡Ephes. vi.: 11, 12.

temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it."\* If there were no temptations, there could be no victories. But men can prevent being taken, or overpowered, by those temptations which are *not human*, but diabolical, if they use the grace given to them to keep free from grievous sin; and though seized by mere human, or common temptations, they can always bear them, and even commonly overcome them, with the strength which God gives them, as he will make the issue glorious for them, by rendering them victorious. Not indeed that they will be able to preserve themselves from all sins, even venial sins, but that, with God's aid, they will succeed to remain steadfast in his holy grace and friendship.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### OF MAN—THE FALL OF MAN—THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

God created man *but little less* than the angels.† Man is a rational creature, made to the image and likeness of God. This likeness is in the soul of man, because it is endowed with reason, intelligence, will and liberty. The human soul is a spirit, able to understand to choose, to know what it should do, and what it does. As the Scripture says: "And the Lord formed man of the slime of the earth: and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul."‡ Man is thus composed of body and soul, the connecting link between the visible and invisible world, between the world of intelligences and the world of matter. God also created the first woman; but instead of taking the slime of the earth to form her body, He cast Adam

---

\* 1 Cor. x: 13.

† Ps. viii: 6.

‡ Gen. 2d chap. v. 6.

into a deep sleep, or trance, and from his side, took one of his ribs: "And built the rib which he took from Adam into a woman."\* By this he gave Adam to understand a great mystery, for Adam said: "This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman because she was taken out of man: Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be two in one flesh." Adam understood and announced the design of God in the institution of marriage, which, as St. Augustine and other fathers tell us, represents the mystery of the union of Christ with human nature and with his church. The most strict union was indicated for those who should form a society with each other in marriage.

That God created the soul of man rational, spiritual, and immortal, is taught us both by faith and reason. The whole of the Christian religion is predicated on this truth. As matter cannot understand and reason, whatever thinks and reasons is spiritual, so also whatever is spiritual is immortal, because, being without parts, it cannot be corrupted or separated. "For how can its substance perish," asks St. Ambrose, "when it is the soul that infuses life? To whom the soul is infused, life is infused; from whom the soul departs, life departs: the soul therefore is life. For how can it receive death, when it is the contrary to it? so also the soul which creates life, does not receive death, and does not die. But the soul does not receive death, and therefore the soul does not die."† "The dust returns into its earth, from whence it was, and the spirit returns to God, who gave it," says the book of Ecclesiastes.‡ In the book of wisdom, we read concerning the just, that: "in the sight of the unwise they *seemed to die*. . . . their hope is full of immortality."§

It is the common opinion of Catholic Theologians that God creates a soul for each person and unites it

---

\* Gen. ch. 2. v. 21, 22, 23. † De Bono Mortis, ch. 9, n. 42. ‡ Eccles. xii. § Wisd. ch. 3, v. 2, 4.

with its appropriate body at the time he creates it, although St. Augustine seemed unwilling to define whether God thus singly creates each soul, or created one spiritual and immortal soul, from which the spiritual and immortal souls of others are derived. Other fathers and theologians were, like him, doubtful as to this question, but the most of the fathers seem to have held the opinion, now common, that God creates a soul for each human person.

When it is asked, why God created man? The answer is that He created him, as He gave existence to all other creatures, for himself, for his own honour and glory. But the end for which he created man considered in himself, was that man might enjoy an eternal beatitude, or, in other words, that he might know, love, serve, and enjoy God for all eternity. This alone can constitute the supreme happiness of a rational, spiritual, immortal creature. For no intelligent creature can be happy unless all his desires are satisfied, and there is left for him nothing to desire or to dread. Whenever he desires or fears something, there is something wanting to his happiness. But except God, there exists nothing that can satisfy all the desires of an intellectual creature. God alone is the supreme good, all other things are finite, subject to vicissitude, inconstant, fleeting, and cannot therefore satisfy their possessor, so that he may neither wish for anything, nor fear anything. "Thou hast made us for thyself oh Lord," says St. Augustine, "and our heart is restless till it rest in Thee."\*

To obtain eternal beatitude Adam and Eve had the opportunity offered them. It was necessary for them to love God above all things else, and for God's sake to love other creatures in due order, first, those creatures in God's image and likeness classed as *the neighbour*, and then, inferior creatures as the works of God. It was further necessary to serve and obey God, and especially in the commandment, which he gave them saying:

---

\* Lib 1, Confes. c. 1, n. 1.



“But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death.”\* They could accomplish this easily; because while in their body and soul all was well regulated, they had all the instruction and aid necessary for this duty. They were blessed with health, and not subjected to infirmity, or old age; they were provided with abundance for the wants of the body, and their souls were in a state of perfect justice and innocence. They knew what was necessary for them to know, their judgment was correct, their minds were serene and unclouded, and they enjoyed perfect liberty. Their will, though free, because of the integrity and justice of their souls, tended rather to good than to evil, and they were able to do as they should choose. The inferior part of the soul was in due subjection to the superior, and their senses were not excited by concupiscence. And, even beyond the order of nature, they had received from God graces, to render the work of their salvation entirely easy for them. Besides, if they proved themselves faithful, they would transmit to their posterity all these blessings.

### *The Fall of Man.*

But man lost every thing by transgressing the commandment of God, and eating the forbidden fruit. His companion was first seduced by man's great adversary, the devil, who, tempting her in the appearance of a beautiful serpent, induced her to eat the forbidden fruit. She afterwards seduced Adam into the same disobedience. They were promised, by the tempter, that “their eyes should be opened, and they should be like gods, knowing good and evil,”† and hence they were led to sin. *Pride, curiosity,* and an *inordinate appetite* caused the fall of Eve, and the same, together with *obsequiousness to his wife,* led Adam into the same misfortune. And what a sin! which brought with it such terrible

---

\* Gen. 2d ch. v. 17.

† Gen. iii: 5.



consequences. St. Augustine finds this sin immense and indescribable. He says: "*Pride* was there, because man loved rather to be in his own power than under that of God; and *sacrilege*, because he did not believe God; and *homicide*, because he precipitated himself into death; and *spiritual fornication*, because the integrity of the human mind was corrupted by the persuasion of the serpent; and *theft*, because he usurped a prohibited food; and *avarice*, because he desired more than was sufficient for him; and, if there is any thing else to be admitted in one, it can be discovered by diligent consideration."\* The facility with which so slight a precept could have been observed, the great reward attached to its observance, the great penalty awaiting its infraction, the freedom from concupiscence which they enjoyed who had to observe it, and the obligations of love and gratitude which they owed to Him, who gave the commandment, combine to enhance the malignity and guilt of this fatal transgression.

The punishment and effects of this sin to our first parents may be thus summed up:

1. They immediately knew that they were naked; and hence sought to conceal their shame with "aprons of *fig leaves*."†

2. They became obnoxious to all kinds of infirmities and sickness, and to the empire of death.

3. They were subjected to ignorance and concupiscence. And though they did not lose freedom of will, they found it debilitated and diminished for that which is good.

4. They lost the empire over living creatures which had been given to them.

5. They were subjected to the power of the Devil.

6. To Adam God said: "Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, cursed is the earth in thy work; with labour and toil thou shalt eat thereof all the days of thy life.

\* Enchirid. 45, n. 13.

† Gen. iii: 7.

Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herbs of the earth. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the earth out of which thou wast taken.”\*

To the woman God said: “I will multiply thy sorrows, and thy conceptions: in sorrow shalt thou bring forth thy children, and thou shalt be under thy husband’s power, and he shall have dominion over thee.”

7. Both were expelled from the terrestrial paradise no more to enter it.

8. The way to eternal life was obstructed, and they deserved eternal loss and punishment.

The concupiscence, which was one of the results of their transgression, is said by the Apostle St. John to be threefold in its nature; viz: “the concupiscence of the flesh, the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life.”† The penalties of pride, curiosity, and an inordinate appetite for food, were visited upon them. They lost their former inclination towards good, and experienced a great propensity to evil.

And for their long line of descendants the same sad evils were made “their heritage of woe,” because, in the incomprehensible providence of God, all were concluded in the first parent of the race, as we are taught by revelation: “By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned.”‡

### *Of the Unity of the Human Race.*

The teaching of faith has always been, that all men are the offspring of Adam and Eve, and the whole system of Christian doctrine is predicated upon this truth of the UNITY of the human race. There is only one human species, whatever speculations naturalists may indulge concerning the varieties and discrepancies which they discover among the inhabitants of the different portions of the globe. The characteristics of

---

\* Gen. iii: 16, 17, &c.    † 1 John ii: 16.    ‡ Rom. v: 12.

different nations, and their different languages, afford important studies and investigations to the mere philosopher, who thinks his time well employed in establishing theories of the philosophy of history, but the christian, *who lives by faith*, knows that all theories which conflict with catholic doctrine, however plausible, are necessarily false. *Species* is said to be "*the succession of similar individuals that reproduce and perpetuate themselves.*" The individuals of the whole human family, however diverse in characteristics they seem, unite and reproduce by generation, with a continued fecundity, which establishes the unity of the human species, while science shows that the variety, existing among the different inhabitants of the earth, can be explained by natural causes. So also has the comparative study of languages led to the discovery of points of contact and strict relationship and affinity among them, and, as Cardinal Wiseman says, this science in its progress "began to discover new affinities where least expected; till by degrees many languages began to be grouped and classified in large families, acknowledged to have a common origin. Then, new inquiries gradually diminished the number of independent languages, and extended, in consequence, the dominion of the larger masses. At length, when this field seemed almost exhausted, a new class of researches has succeeded, so far as it has been tried, in proving the extraordinary affinities between these families—affinities existing in the very character and essence of each language, so that none of them could ever have existed, without those elements wherein the resemblances consist. Now, as this excludes all idea of one having borrowed them from the other, as they could not have arisen in each by independent processes; and as the radical difference among the languages forbids their being considered dialects or offshoots from one another, we are driven to the conclusion, that, on the one hand, these languages must have originally been united in one, whence they draw these common elements essential to them all; and, on the other, that the separation between them,

which destroyed other no less important elements of resemblance, could not have been caused by any gradual departure or individual development—for these we have long since excluded—but by some violent, unusual, and active force, sufficient alone to reconcile these conflicting appearances, and to account at once for the resemblances, and the differences. It would be difficult, methinks, to say what further step the most insatiable or unreasonable sceptic could require, to bring the results of this science into close accordance with the scriptural account.”\*

“And the earth was one tongue, and of the same speech,”† we are assured in Genesis, but God confounded their tongue, and so scattered them into all lands, and hence the diversity of languages. No diversity of characteristics and languages can ever prove a diversity of the human species against the declaration of Scripture that the first woman was called *Eve*, “because she was the mother of all the living.”‡

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### OF ORIGINAL SIN.

That all the posterity of Adam, except the Blessed Virgin mother of the incarnate God, are conceived under the guilt and penalties of the sin of Adam and Eve, is a doctrine of faith. ORIGINAL SIN is then, as the name imports, the stain and disgrace in which we are born, because of the sin of our first parents: and by which we are made obnoxious to sickness, infirmities, death, ignorance; to the threefold concupiscence before spo-

---

\* Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion, Dis. 2d, p. 67, Andover E. 1. 1837.

† Gen. xi.      ‡ Gen. iii: 20.

ken of, and even slaves of the Devil, children of wrath, and subject to eternal perdition. St. Paul tells the Ephesians that they "were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest."\* "Behold," says the Psalmist, "I was conceived in iniquities, and in sin did my mother conceive me."† And holy Job asks: "Who can make him clean that is conceived of unclean seed? Is it not thou, who only art."‡ "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned."§

Original sin is a mystery, and one which we are neither able nor required to comprehend. It being the will of God to conclude all their posterity under the responsibility of the first parents, it must have been right and just, since God cannot be otherwise than infinitely just and perfect. "How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways."|| In the fifth and sixth sessions of the council of Trent, this doctrine is lucidly declared as always pertaining to Catholic faith. It is shown that Adam's fault is the cause and type of the sin, with which we are born, and our attention is called particularly to three things: 1st. The act of disobedience, by which our first parents transgressed the precept of God; 2dly. The loss of the sanctity and justice in which they had been established, as the immediate result of their act of prevarication; 3rdly. The consequences of this privation of sanctity and justice, that is the degradation and disorder of nature, the degradation of soul and body, and finally death, which came as a visible and material avenger of this revolt. What ravages were produced in man by this primitive fault! It was not the *actual* fault that passed to the descendants of Adam, for this was personal, but the direct and immediate effects of the actual fault, the loss of justice and sanctity; and this loss or privation of justice and sanctity is *sin, which is the death of the soul*, for the soul is thus in *the state of sin*, and de-

---

\* Ephes. ii: 3. † Ps. l: 7. ‡ Job xiv: 4. § Rom. v. 12.  
|| Rom. xi: 33.



prived of the friendship of God, and of union with him, which constitutes the life of the soul. We are born, not in the *act* of sin, but in the *state* of sin; for we are born in a state of rupture and separation from God, deprived of the justice and holiness by which he wished to unite man to himself. And this state or condition is propagated with our race, and is inherent with each individual of it; for the human nature was, in its head or fountain, deprived of original justice and holiness, and constituted in a state of separation from God, which is a condition, sin only can cause. Whoever descends from Adam is born with a fallen nature, and in a state of separation from God, or a state of sin. And as this state is transmitted by propagation, infants are born stained and sullied by this sin; and the necessity of baptism, as the means of purifying them from this defilement, and of restoring to them the friendship of God, by investing them with justice and holiness, the life of the soul, exists for infants as well as for adults. Baptism effaces all that truly and properly belongs to the nature of sin, and regenerates those who were born "children of wrath," but baptism does not remove all the consequences of sin in effacing what pertains to the nature thereof, for in restoring his friendship God does not restore all the privileges and exemptions he first bestowed upon man, but leaves him exposed to infirmities, sufferings, and death, and even to that concupiscence, sometimes named *sin*, because "*it comes from sin, and inclines to sin,*" and which induces so many combats, but which "*can never hurt those who refuse to consent to it.*"

The council of Trent teaches that the children of Adam can only recover justice and holiness, and merit eternal life through the merits and grace of Jesus Christ the Saviour, but that man has not lost freedom of will, which was weakened though not destroyed by sin, and that the actions of man in his fallen state, performed without grace, are not necessarily sins, and deserving of God's hatred, as some innovators have falsely taught.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE MERCIFUL PROMISE OF A REDEEMER.

There remained no hope for the reparation of the evil consequences of sin, except in the mercy of God. Man, of himself, had no means of adequate expiation, and no sufficient force to rise from his degradation. But God was merciful, as man had fallen under the seduction of a power superior to himself; and God said to the serpent, the representative and instrument of that evil spirit: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel."\* To Eve the mother of our race, God thus gave promise of victory and reparation.

This promise concerned the whole human race, and hence with all the nations of the earth, historians have found evidences of the expectation of a *sage*, a *deliverer*, a *restorer*, a *redeemer*. A universal tradition descended everywhere among human generations, encouraging the hope of a saviour, who, by *expiation*, should restore peace and happiness to men, and inaugurate the golden age. The ignorance and error, introduced by idolatry into different nations, obscured this tradition, among all except the people of God, but obliterated it among none of them. In their ignorance and blindness, most of them multiplied mediators between themselves and the Deity; they made the planets and stars the dwelling places of intelligences, who, as they supposed, regulated their motions, and whom they sought to propitiate by their vows and prayers; but many also felt the insufficiency of such mediators, and, with more correct knowledge of the first traditions of the race, hoped that God himself would come to their aid, and enlighten them concerning the worship He desired, and

---

\* Gen. iii: 15.

furnish the means of remedying the evils of corrupted nature.

“Among all nations,” says Prideux, “from the beginning, the expectation of a mediator between God and man was a reigning opinion.”\*

Concerning the fact of this tradition all are agreed, and even infidel writers, such as Boulanger, Voltaire, Volney, and others, admit its universal existence. The subordinate God of the Egyptians, the chief of celestial spirits, called *Wisdom*, and the Mithra of the Persians, were but forms of this tradition. One of the Herms, among the Egyptians, was called the *saviour of men*.

The Arabs expected a deliverer, who was to save the nations; and even in China, the belief, that the primitive religion, which had been corrupted, should be restored by one to come, has been found among the theological opinions of that people.†

The impossibility of men, of themselves, finding out true Wisdom, and the necessity of a *supernatural teacher*, to inform them what should be their sentiments towards God and towards each other, was taught by Plato, who, in his second Alcibiades, puts the opinion in the mouth of Socrates. Virgil; in his 4th Eclogue, refers to the same expectation of the advent of a divino infant, who should restore order, efface crime, and deliver the earth from fear; so that the promised redeemer was truly, as is declared in Genesis, “the expectation of nations.”

And strange to say, as the moment approached, when the earth should see all these expectations fulfilled, the expectations themselves insensibly became more active. And especially among the Jews, about the time of the advent of Jesus Christ, was there such an excitement about the coming of the Messiah, as to arouse the attention of the pagans to the fact, that, through the

\* Hist of the Jews, lib. iii.

† De Guignes, Memoires de l'Academie, tom. LXV. cited by Goussier

Messiah, they hoped their nation should hold the empire of the world. Tacitus,\* in his history, and Suetonius,† in his work on Vespasian, show this fact. But centuries were to elapse before this promise of God should be fulfilled. The earth was peopled, men increased in numbers and became daily more and more corrupt, until the anger of God was visited upon them by that universal deluge, the account of which is given to us in the books of Moses, and of which, the early traditions of all nations, and the discoveries of science, bear indubitable testimony. In the ark, which Noah erected under the express command of God, eight human beings were preserved from this dread catastrophe.

This event occurred in the year 1656, from the creation of the world. In the ark, besides Noah, his wife, his three sons and their wives, God had caused two and two of all flesh, and living things, and fowls, and birds, and creeping things, to be preserved. And from the ark, did all these come forth after the deluge, and the earth was again repopled by Noah and his descendants. Our race had so multiplied in a hundred and one years, that they proposed to separate, and divide themselves over the earth. But first they desired to erect a tower, which should reach to the heavens, as if they distrusted the pledge of God, when he set, in the clouds, the rainbow of his promise, not again to submerge the earth with a deluge. This tower received the name of *Babel*, because God descended, and confounded the audacity of men, by confusing their speech so that they could not understand each other. Thus a separation was rendered necessary; and nations, with different languages, began to be found in different parts of the earth.

This chastisement did not cause men to become bet-

---

\* Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judeâ rerum potirentur. Hist. lib. v. No. xiii.

† Percrebnerat Oriente toto, vetas et constans opinio esse in satiz, ut eo tempore Judeâ profecti, rerum potirentur. Suet. in Vespasiano.



ter. On the contrary, with a few exceptions, they became more or less forgetful of the truths traditional among them, and, falling into idolatry, began to adore creatures instead of God. Leaving them in their corruption, God commenced to prepare for himself a chosen people. He selected Abraham, before called Abram, to be the father of believers, and made a covenant with him, and appointed *circumcision*, the figure of baptism, as a sign for the consecration of his posterity as his peculiar servants. The Jews, or Israelites, the posterity of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob, became the chosen people of God, the preservers of the traditions of the human race, and of God's primitive revelations to men, and had the special mission to preserve the hope of man's redemption. But, excepting the patriarchs and some others who were figures of the expected Messiah, the most of them lived so negligently and perversely, that God determined to renew the promulgation of his law in a most striking manner. This occurred about the year of the world 2513, and about 1491 years before Jesus Christ. With great solemnity upon Mount Sinai, God gave, to his servant Moses, his holy law, written on tablets of stone, to be promulgated to the people, and gave special directions to Moses as to the sacrifices, ceremonies, and rites of religion. These ceremonies and rites were to be shadows and figures to be fulfilled under the new law of grace, which should be promulgated by the Saviour, when he should arrive; as also the sacrifices were to be figures of his sacrifice. The people generally failed to correspond with the merciful designs of God, who, by favors and chastisements, endeavoured to conduct them in the paths of truth and virtue. To effect this purpose, as well as for the benefit of the nations of the future, who should be the inheritance of his divine Son, he raised up a long line of prophets, through whom he more distinctly renewed his promises of a Saviour, and gave of him such detailed characteristics, that when he should come, he might be easily recognised. Of these prophets, greater and less, there were sixteen who were thus



sent to instruct the people, and to predict to them future events, of which the world has since beheld the fulfillment.

Man's ingenuity has led him to enquire, why God so long delayed to fulfill his promise of sending the redeemer? To this question, theologians give a satisfactory answer. They say that God had sufficient motives for this delay.—First, he wished men to know, by a sad and long experience, the need they had of a teacher and Saviour; 2dly, that knowing their need, they might ardently desire and sigh for his advent, and, with ardent prayers, beg this blessing from God, as did the patriarchs and prophets; 3dly, that before his coming, he might make known, through his prophets, all the circumstances regarding him, and the changes he was to produce on the earth; lastly, that we Christians might be secure of the truth of our holy religion, seeing and believing that what was so long predicted, has been so wonderfully and exactly fulfilled, and what was shown in *figuro* has been accomplished in reality.

All the Old Testament is full of figures, commencing with the fall of Adam and the promise of a redeemer in the beginning of the history of our race. The two children of Adam, Cain and Abel, are figures, Cain, of the Jewish people, and Abel, of Jesus Christ. Cain was the senior, and the Hebrews were before Jesus Christ according to his temporal birth. Cain was a tiller of the soil, an image of the Jews attached to the goods of the earth. Abel had the office of shepherd, as Jesus Christ is "the good shepherd." Cain honored God only with his lips, as did the Jews; "this people honors me with their lips." Abel offered himself to God with his heart, as St. Paul says of Christ. God rejected Cain and his sacrifices, as he has rejected the Jews and their sacrifices. But Abel and his sacrifices were accepted by God, as Jesus Christ and his sacrifice are the complacency of God. The envy of Cain caused the death of Abel, and the Jews through envy, put Jesus Christ, their brother, to death. The blood of Abel cried out for vengeance against Cain. The blood

of Jesus Christ cries out for vengeance against the Jews, and against sinners, who, by their sins, render it useless. Cain, in chastisement, leads a vagabond life, and has a sign put on him that he might not be killed. And the Jews, exiled from their Kingdom, go wandering through the whole world, bearing the mark of circumcision.

But another question has also been asked, in view of this long delay of centuries in the coming of the Saviour of men. What possibility of salvation for all those men, who, born in the interval, with the guilt of original sin, and becoming guilty of other sins, are also incapable of satisfying divine justice? To this question it is answered, that, according to Catholic teaching, from the very moment God made the promise of the redeemer, the most happy results commenced to flow from it, and, from that moment, the redeemer began to aid man and to reconcile him with God. Jesus Christ takes rule over all time. "*He is to day, yesterday and forever.*"\* He is "the lamb that was slain from the beginning of the world."† From the beginning, he offered himself to the divine justice to reconcile men to his Father. "Let them cease their complaints," exclaims St. Leo the great, "who unworthily calumniate divine Providence, accusing it of so long having retarded the birth of the Saviour, as if anterior ages had not received the fruit of the mysteries, realized in the last ages of the world. For the incarnation of the *Word*, has, before its accomplishment, produced what it has produced since; and never, even in the most distant antiquity, was the mystery of salvation without its fruit. What the Apostles preached, the prophets have announced; and that which has always been believed, could not be regarded as accomplished too late."‡ "It is not therefore by a new design, or a tardy compassion, that God has provided for human affairs; but, from the origin of the world, he

\* Heb. xiii: 8. † Apoc. xiii: 8.

‡ "Nec serò est impletum, quod semper est creditum."

has established for all men, one only and the same cause of salvation. The grace of God, by which the saints of all times have been justified, has, without doubt, increased by the birth of Jesus Christ, but it is not then that it commenced.\*

Instead of viewing Jesus Christ, as infidels do, as a sort of accident in the life of humanity, an extraordinary personage, appearing and disappearing on an isolated point in history, Catholic doctrine considers him as occupying the whole history of humanity; as the centre of all in the moral and religious order, and attaching all to himself. "For in him," says St. Paul, "were all things created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and in him. And he is before all, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body of the church, who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he may hold the primacy; because in him it hath well pleased the Father, that all fullness should dwell; and through him to reconcile all things to himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things on earth, and the things that are in heaven."† The Saviour is then all in all, and, "through the blood of his cross," comes all reconciliation between God and men. He is the head of the Church, which, from the beginning of the world to the consummation of all things, brings individuals into union with him; the source of all grace to fallen humanity.

\* St. Paul testifies, that God "will have all men to be saved;" and hence Catholic doctors teach, that he offers the means of salvation to all men. As St. Thomas declares: "God wishes all men to be saved, and therefore grace is wanting to no one, but communicates itself to all, as far as is in it."‡ The necessity of

\* *Sermo de Nativitate Domini.* Migne's Edition.

† Col. ch. i: 16-20.

‡ In Ep. ad Hæbr. c. 12, lect. 3. Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri, et ideo gratia nulli deest, sed omnibus, quantum in se est, se communicat.

faith as the foundation and root of justification, is a settled Catholic doctrine, for "without faith it is impossible to please God."\* But the faith, required of those who lived before Jesus Christ, appears from the declaration of St. Paul, to be faith *in God, the rewarder to them that seek him.* "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and is a rewarder to them that seek him,"† says the Apostle.

A belief in divine providence, and a belief in God as the liberator of men, saving them by means pleasing to himself, includes an implicit faith in the mediator, by whom only men can be saved, and hence, though the Jews had to believe and observe the written law, the Gentiles were not to be judged by the Mosaic law, but according to the natural law. "written in their hearts."‡ To this natural law, the Psalmist refers when he says: "The light of thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us,"§ and by this light of the natural law, and aided by the sufficient grace which God gave them through the merits of Christ, men could, 1st, believe in one only God, creator of the universe, adore, serve, and love him above all things. 2dly. They could love their neighbour as themselves, abstain from all injustice, and live according to conscience and right reason. 3dly. They could expect the redeemer, and hope in him, in proportion as they were acquainted with the tradition, which was so universal among the nations, and thus, abstaining from the worship of idols, they were able to secure salvation, or the supreme good: "*Glory, honor and peace to every one that worketh good.*|| to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (or Gentile.)

But how many among those who preceded Christ, corresponded with God's will, for their salvation, is a secret that remains with himself.

It may be of utility, before concluding this chapter, to indicate some of the prophecies made regarding the

\* Heb. xi: 6. † Heb. xi: 6. ‡ Rom. ii: 15. § Ps. iv: 7.  
|| Rom. ii: 10.

Messiah, and which have been so marvellously accomplished in Jesus Christ. When the patriarch Jacob was about to die, he said to his sons: "The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda, nor a ruler from his thigh, till he come that is to be sent, and he shall be the expectation of nations."\* Eighteen centuries have passed since the authority, which Juda was to hold until the advent of the Messiah, was taken away by the usurpation of Herod, the stranger, and Jerusalem itself soon afterwards was destroyed and the political existence of the Jewish nation was extinguished. Between the loss of the sceptre and the ruin of the nation, stands the one who was to be sent as "the expectation of nations," and Jacob's prediction fulfilled indicates Jesus, the Saviour. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse," writes Isaias, "and a flower shall rise up out of his root, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him."† "And thou Bethlehem Ephrata art a little one among the thousands of Juda: out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be the ruler in Israel, and his going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity."‡ Zachariah speaks of him as the king of peace, as the Saviour King, and mentions the mode of his entry into the city of Jerusalem.§ Isaias shows how the Jews will reject him, how they will be chastised, and how the Gentiles will be converted?|| Daniel indicates the time when the people shall renounce him, put him to death, and cease to be his people.¶ Osee tells the consequent condition of the Jews: "For the children of Israel shall sit many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without altar, and without Ephod, and without Theraphim."\*\* What a wonderful fulfillment of this prophecy in the history of this extraordinary people for eighteen centuries; existing distinct amid nations but with no nationality, like waters

---

\* Gen. xlix: 10. † Isaias, ch. xi: 1. ‡ Micheas, ch. v: 2.

§ Zacharias, ch. iv: 9. || Isaias, ch. vi: 9, &c. ¶ Daniel c. ix: v. 26. \*\* Osee, ch. iii: 4.



that refuse to mingle with the ocean, and in desolation, because they have neither sacrifice nor altar, and yet imagining that their Messiah, whom their nation has always expected, is yet to come! They have even lived to dwell amid a people who consider it a glory and a boast that they themselves have "no sacrifice and no altar," which their prophet foretold as a sign of ruin and desolation.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

JESUS CHRIST—THE INCARNATION—THE MOTHER OF GOD, OR THE BLESSED VIRGIN—THE REDEMPTION—THE CROSS.

The Catholic doctrine, regarding Jesus Christ, looks to two points chiefly: 1st. His person, or "the Incarnation;" 2dly. His work, or "the Redemption." From these two sources flow all the distinctive truths of Christianity.

We are told that "God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten son: that whoever believeth in him, may not perish, but may have everlasting life."\* Also: "And the word was made flesh and dwelt among us."† "The word was made flesh."—The only begotten son of God, second person of the most holy Trinity, took human nature and united it to himself in a hypostatic or personal union; and this is the mystery of the Incarnation, believed and professed by the Catholic Church.

The Incarnation is then the personal union of the Word of God, his only son, with the human nature in Jesus Christ, so that Jesus Christ is, at the same time, God and man, though in him, there is only one person,

---

\* John iii: 16. † John i: 14

the divine person. It is defined thus: The hypostatic union of the divine and human natures in the unique person of the Word made flesh, called Jesus Christ. The doctrine of the church concerning this mystery is found in this definition, as shown in the Apostle's Creed, and is expressed with more development in the creed called the Athanasian.

In the last named creed, we read thus: "It is necessary for eternal salvation to believe faithfully in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now the true faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. He is God, being begotten from the substance of the Father before all ages; and he is man, being born of the substance of his mother in time. *Perfect God, perfect man*, being a reasonable soul and a human flesh. Equal to the Father according to the divinity, and inferior to the Father according to the humanity. Although he is God and man, there are not however two Christs, but there is only one Christ. *One*, not that the divinity has been changed into the humanity, but because God has taken the humanity and united it to his divinity. *One*, therefore, not by confusion of the substance, but by unity of the person. For as the reasonable soul and the body are only one man, so God and man are only one Christ."—*Creed of St. Athanasius*.

In this profession of faith there are three distinct points enunciated. 1st. The divine nature of Jesus Christ; 2nd. His human nature; 3rdly. The union of these two natures in one only person, which is the divine person of the Word. This doctrine also includes the following consequences: 1st, from the union of the two natures in one person, it follows that Christ, according to the properties of either nature, can at one time be said to be equal to the Father, as he says of himself: "I and the Father are one,"\* since this is true of his divine nature. And at another time that he is less than the Father, as when he says: "The

---

\* John x: 30.

Father is greater than I;” \* which is true of his human nature.

2dly, That, speaking of Jesus Christ, we may attribute to God what pertains to man, and to man what pertains to God, because he is the same person, who is at the same time God and man. Thus we may say that God suffered, died, arose again; or say that he is man, is the son of God, or is God. This consequence theologians indicate by the term *communication of idioms*.

3rdly, That as only the person of the Son became incarnate, and the three persons in the Godhead are distinct from each other as persons, we cannot say either of the Father, or of the Holy Ghost, that He became incarnate, or suffered, or died, because the conjunction of the divine and human natures only took place in the person of the Son, and not in that of the Father or of the Holy Ghost. 4thly, That because in Jesus Christ, there are united two distinct intelligent natures, there are also two distinct wills, the divine and human, with a perfect coherence between the two, the less perfect being always subordinate to the more perfect, the human to the divine.

We are to believe this mystery and the consequences which it includes, because it is revealed to us by God, but we can neither imagine how this union is accomplished, nor can our reason comprehend or understand it. God does not require us to understand it, but to receive it with the homage of faith.

The divinity of Jesus Christ is clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures. For instance: “As the Father raiseth up the dead and giveth life: so the Son also giveth life to whom he will. For neither doth the Father judge any man; but hath given all judgment to the Son. That all men may honour the Son as they honour the Father,” John v.: 21, &c. Again: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son also to have life in himself.” Ib., vs. 26. Also St. John’s declaration: “The Word was God;—The

---

\*John xiv. 28.

Word was made flesh." Ch. 1. Also, "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John 1: 18. It was not as man, but as his Son in his bosom, that he knew him: he knew the Father, because he is God himself, and the true Son of God. Again: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by his Son, by whom also he made the world." Heb., ch. 1: v. 1, 2. It is then he who created all things.

The apostle who, in his gospel, so sublimely states the dogma of the divinity of the Word, and that he became flesh, in his first epistle says: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life,"—"We have seen and do bear witness and declare to you the eternal life which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us." That is to say: the Word, who is eternal life, hath appeared to us, and we declare him to you, "that you may have fellowship with us, and that our fellowship may be with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John, ch. 1, 2, 3. "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." 1 Ep., v. 5. Besides, Jesus declares to his friends that he is God: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to you, but my Father, who is in Heaven." Math. xvi. He declares it to the multitude: "It is my Father who glorifieth me—Amen! Amen! I say unto you before Abraham was made, I am;" and thus claims to be self-existent, and, therefore, God. John viii. He declares the same before the tribunals of the country, when adjured: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us if thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith to him: Thou hast said it." Math. xxvi.: 63. And the answer in St. Mark is more direct. "And Jesus said to him: *I am*; And you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming with

the clouds of Heaven." Mark xiv.: 62. All his life and acts to the end were in harmony with his claim to be equal to God.

*The Mother of God.—The Blessed Virgin Mary.*

Having determined to manifest himself to man in the flesh with a real human body, God selected the most excellent of human creatures for his mother, a young and holy virgin, descended from the royal line of David, but poor and unknown. From her womb, he assumed the substance of human nature, and united it, in some incomprehensible manner, in his divine personality, with the divine substance, which he received from all eternity by generation from the Father, and thus, being the only begotten Son of God the Father, in his divine nature, he became the only son of the Virgin Mary, in his human nature, and being at the same time God and man, but only one person, his virgin mother became truly "*Mother of God.*" From her he received the body which fitted him to be the redeemer of the human race.

The divine maternity of Mary, in whom only are found maternity and virginity, is then a capital tenet of Catholic faith, placing her with her divine Son in the centre of the circle of Christian dogmas.

A creature privileged above all others, she is enriched with all graces, endowed with glorious titles and prerogatives, and exalted above all creatures, above angels as well as saints.

She not only justly bears the title of *mother of God*, but, in becoming mother, remained a *virgin*, and deserved and wears the title of *ever a virgin*. Though Jesus Christ, in the Scriptures, is represented as calling certain persons his *brothers*, yet it was only according to the Jewish custom of speech, which gave this name to cousins and other near relations, and not that his mother ever gave birth to other children. And the Scriptures themselves show who were the mothers of



these persons, thus designated as the brothers of Jesus.

It is also the faith of the Catholic church, that the Blessed Virgin Mary never sullied her soul with the stain of actual sin, even venial sin. This was a special privilege granted to the holy mother of God.

It has also been generally of Catholic belief, and in our own days has been defined as an article of faith, that God gave to the Blessed Virgin Mary the extraordinary privilege of exemption from the stain of original sin. It is defined, as of divine revelation, that the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception in the womb of her mother, "by a special grace and privilege of God omnipotent, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, has been preserved and exempted from all stain of original sin." This is the doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception* of the Virgin Mother of God.\*

Before this definition was made, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was in the same condition as the doctrine of her *assumption* into Heaven is, at present. It was believed by the children of the church, and had its appropriate place in the Calendar of feasts and its proper day and mass, just as the Assumption now has, and pious Catholics devoutly believed that Mary had received this extraordinary privilege, and prayed that a definition should be given to the world by the voice of the church. When defined, they received no new point of faith, but an authorized definition of what already they believed.

As Mary is the mother of the Son of God, and was made so by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, she is rightly styled the spouse of the Eternal Father, and the sanctuary of the Holy Ghost. The mutual love of the Father and the Son, which in God is infinite and perfect, and, therefore, *personal*, and who is the third per-

---

\*Defined in Dec'br. 1851. The Council of Trent, in its decree concerning original sin, declared: that it is not its intention to include the Blessed Virgin.—Sess. v.

son of the Adorable Trinity, came upon Mary to associate her with the divine paternity of the Father, that she might conceive a son, who, at the same time, should be his eternal and only begotten son. As Jesus Christ is engendered from all eternity from the sole substance of the Eternal Father, so in time is he engendered from the sole substance of his virgin mother, the wonderful offspring of two mysterious spiritual generations, the first eternal, and divine, the other in time and human. In the divine the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son as the spiration of love; and in the human the Holy Ghost, the personal love of the Father and Son, consecrates the sanctuary, in which the son is to receive a new birth from a virgin, with whom the Father shares his divine paternity.

All divine operations *ad extra* are common to the three divine persons, yet the Scriptures and the Creed teach us that "Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary." This mystery is attributed especially to the Holy Ghost as a most wonderful miracle of power and love. He did not generate, but created the humanity of Christ; but the Virgin Mary generated the body from her own substance by the power of the Holy Ghost, and giving birth to him, who was never man a moment without being also God, she became truly *mother of God*, and could truly call Him son, whom the Eternal Father also called his only begotten son.

Who can imagine the greatness of this dignity, the sublimity of this association of Mary with the three divine persons of the Godhead, the height and depth and breadth of these fundamental mysteries of Christianity!

*The Work of Redemption.—The Cross.*

The knowledge that the Son of God has become man, induces the question, why did he become man? Catholic doctrine answers with the Creed: "For us men, and for our salvation he descended from heaven," and

was made man. Under the title of *Saviour of mankind*, he is known, loved and adored; hence his name is JESUS. "She shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name JESUS. For he shall save his people from their sins."\* "For God indeed was in Christ reconciling the world to himself."†

Whether the general plan of divine Providence contemplated the holy mystery of the Incarnation as the end for which God created the world, that he might communicate himself, and bring about the union of intelligent creatures with himself; or whether the rigorous demands of divine justice rendered the incarnation a necessity for the manifestation of infinite mercy to our race, "that justice and peace might embrace,"‡ it is distinctly taught as a tenet of Catholic faith, that the Eternal Son of God became man, in order to redeem and save mankind. To suppose that God could not have accorded pardon to our race without the price paid for it by the Redeemer, had he willed to do so, would not be credible; but to receive the satisfaction which his supreme justice required, at the same time that his infinite mercy displayed itself in forgiving, the mysteries of the incarnation and the cross became indispensable. A substituted victim of infinite merit and value, and yet a victim of our race, and representing our race was needed, to the end that justice might be duly satisfied, and mercy be manifested.

To blot out our sins, the satisfaction of Christ was therefore for us entirely necessary. By his death on the cross he redeemed us, and merited for us justification. "He was offered, because it was his own will," and "the Lord laid on him the iniquities of us all."§ He died for the salvation of all men, and if any perish, it will not be because ample satisfaction has not been made for them, but because they have failed to secure an application to themselves of the merits of Christ. The just offered himself for the unjust, he offered himself freely, of his own will, and because of his love,

---

\*Math. 1: 21. †2 Cor., v. 19. ‡Ps. 81: 11. §Isaius. liii.

and he abundantly merited forgiveness for all, and by his obedience and humiliations merited, for himself as man, an exaltation most extraordinary, and a name above all names. "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world."\* He alone bears the title of Mediator: "For there is one God, and one mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all."†

He chose the cross as the altar of his sacrifice, that life might arise from whence death had sprung, and that the devil; who from the tree had conquered, should in the tree be overcome. He chose an ignominious and cruel death on the cross, in order to heal in us the concupiscence of the flesh, the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life. He chose to be crucified amid abandonment, contempt, sufferings and agony. in order to signify to us the deformity and atrocity of sin, which demanded such an extraordinary punishment and expiation.

The following are the chief benefits which he has merited for us by his death :

1. He has washed us from our sins in his blood.
2. He has liberated us from the servitude of the devil, and rescued us from the powers of darkness and the jaws of hell.
3. He has transferred us into his kingdom, and opened for us the gates of heaven, which sin had closed.
4. He has presented to us the exemplar of all the virtues, the practice of which is necessary for obtaining the kingdom of heaven.
5. He has merited for us all the graces, which enable us to practice virtues, and to secure eternal life. We can do nothing without him, and his blood is the fountain from which all graces flow.

The supereminent science of salvation is the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and him crucified; "to those who perish a folly, but to such as are saved, the power of

---

\* 1 John 11. 2. † 1 Tim. 11. 5.

God."\* But this science is not a mere speculative faith in Jesus Christ crucified. It is an active faith, which labors "to make up what is wanting in the passion of Christ," † which is the application of his merits. To effect the application of his merits to individuals, Jesus Christ established his Church, instituted his sacraments, gave existence to his perpetual sacrifice, commissioned his apostles to go and preach his gospel, and the kingdom of God to all nations, to administer his sacraments, and to set up his cross as "a standard to the peoples." ‡ He declared to all that it is necessary for them, "to work out their salvation," and said: "he that will come after me let him deny himself, take up his cross daily, and follow me." § As he paid the price, || it was his right to place the conditions upon which he would share his merits and his glory with others. And that none might entertain a doubt of his ability to fulfil his promises, in addition to the numerous miracles of his life, he arose triumphantly from among the dead, on the third day, as he had foretold, and, for forty days, gave numerous proofs of the reality of his resurrection, and, finally, in sight of a multitude of witnesses, left the earth and ascended to the right hand of his Father.

---

\* 1 Cor. 1: 17. † Col. 1: 24. ‡ Isaias xlix: 22.

§ St Luke ix: 23.

|| "For you are bought with a great price" 1 Cor. vi: 20. "Christ died for us; much more therefore, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Rom. v: 9, 10. It is necessary with faith to live the life of Christ to obtain salvation, as his Apostle declares: "That he left us an example that we might follow his steps." 1 Pet. ii: 21.



## CHAPTER VII.

OF THE HOLY GHOST—HE IS A TRUE PERSON—HIS DIVINITY PROVED—HE IS CONSUBSTANTIAL WITH THE FATHER AND THE SON—THE HOLY GHOST PROCEEDS FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON—HIS GIFTS AND FRUITS.

At a very early period of Christianity, there appeared heretics, who impugned the doctrines of faith regarding the third person of the Blessed Trinity, as professed in the Apostles' creed, which says: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The martyr, Ignatius, mentions several, of whom some denied the existence of the Holy Ghost altogether, others declared that he was the same with the Father and the Son, and others, such as *Valentinus*, depressed the Son and the Holy Ghost to the mere condition of angels. The controversy with Arius about the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which he denied, seemed for a time to absorb all minds, and little mention occurred in the controversy about the question of the Holy Ghost. The divinity of the Son of God was vindicated and declared by the Council of Nice, and Arius and his followers were condemned in 325. It was one of his followers, *Macedonius*, who again broached a heresy with regard to the Holy Ghost, whom he excluded from the divine essence, and asserted to be a mere creature of the Father and the Son. In 381 the Macedonian Heresy was condemned by the general council of Constantinople. These councils professed, as in the Apostles' Creed, faith "in the Holy Ghost," and placed the three divine persons on equality as worthy to be adored and glorified together. *Macedonius* did not deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, but other heretics, as reported by St. Gregory Nazianzen, did so, pretending that he was a mere energy or quality. Again some of them considered him a mere creature, and others a person of a different na-

ture from God, and of inferior dignity to the Father and Son. A council of Alexandria in 362, over which St. Athanasius presided, condemned as heretics those who should assert that the Holy Ghost is a creature. A council in Illyricum, held in 367, as Theodoret testifies, defined the divinity of the Holy Ghost; and shortly afterwards one, held at Rome, under Pope Damasus, defined, against Auxentius, that he is of one and the same substance with the Father. The *Socinians* of more modern days differ from most of the ancient opponents of the Holy Ghost, who admitted his personality, which they deny. The *Socinians* represent that the Holy Ghost is but the power of God, a mere energy or quality, as did some of the ancient heretics.

It is of faith that the Holy Ghost is a person; the third person of the Blessed Trinity, God as the Father and the Son, God with the Father and the Son; that with them He is co-equal, and consubstantial; that these three persons are one God, as St. John says: "The Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost, and these three are one;"\* And that the Holy Ghost is to be adored and glorified together with the Father and the Son.

*Proofs that the Holy Ghost is a True Person, not a mere Quality.*

That the Holy Ghost is a person is proved from the Holy Scriptures first, because to him are attributed operations proper to persons. The Scriptures declare that he teaches: "He will teach you all things." John xiv: 26. Secondly, He is represented as a witness: "He will give testimony of me." John xv: 26. Thirdly, He is represented as searching the deep things of God: "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God." 1 Cor. ii: 10. Fourthly, He appoints to the ministry of the church; "The Holy Ghost said to them: separate me Saul and Barnabas,

---

\* 1st Epis. of St. John, ch. v: 7.

for the work whereunto I have taken them." Acts xiii: 2. Fifthly, He operates according to his own will, and bestows gifts; "But all these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as he will." 1 Cor. xii: 11. Sixthly, He is represented as aiding our infirmities, and praying for us: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity. For we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings." Rom. viii: 26. And when St. Paul asked at Ephesus of certain disciples: "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed?"\* They said: "We have not so much as heard whether there be a Holy Ghost," it is evident they understood a person to be spoken of, and not a mere quality, for they knew that God could bestow supernatural gifts, and would not have said: "we have not heard whether there be a Holy Ghost," as speaking of a virtue or quality.

Secondly. The same is proved from passages, which show that He proceeds from the Father, is sent by the Father and the Son, and is another person than the Son. "I will ask the Father and He shall give you another Paraclete." John xiv: 16. Again: "But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall give testimony of me." John xv: 26. Again: "It is expedient to you that I go: for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you: But if I go, I will send him to you. And when He is come, He will convince the world of sin, and of justice, and of judgment." John xvi: 7, 8. These all clearly indicate a person.

Thirdly. We read in the Scriptures, that the Holy Ghost assumed a visible appearance, as of that of a dove at the baptism of Jesus Christ, and of tongues of fire on the day of Pentecost. And we do not read of a mere quality or even a divine attribute assuming a visible form. In St. Luke iii: 22, we read: "And tho

---

\* Acts xix: 2

Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape as a dove upon him." And in Acts ii: 3, 4, "And there appeared to them parted tongues as it were of fire, and it sat upon every one of them: And they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with divers tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak." They received not merely gifts, but the Holy Ghost himself. This faith is also clearly shown in the writings of the fathers and doctors of the church.

*Proofs that the Holy Ghost is God.*

In the holy Scriptures, He is called *God* and *Lord*. Isaias represents that he "heard the voice of the Lord," (Jehovah.) Is. ch. vi: v. 8, and St. Paul tells us, "Well did the Holy Ghost speak to our fathers by Isaias the prophet,"\* thus showing that the Holy Ghost is the Lord who spoke to Isaias, and therefore representing him as a person and as God. David also writes thus in the 23rd chapter of the second book of Kings: "The spirit of the Lord hath spoken by me, and his word by my tongue. The God of Israel said to me, the strong one of Israel spoke, the ruler of men," and St. Peter, in Acts ch. i: 16, represents that it was "the Holy Ghost who spoke before by the mouth of David." Therefore the Holy Ghost is the *God* of Israel, the *strong* one, the *ruler* of men. In the Old Testament, God, Jehovah, is represented as speaking by the prophets, and the New Testament declares that these prophets were inspired by the Holy Ghost. "For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time; but the holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost," writes St. Peter, prince of the Apostles. 2 Epistle, v. 21. The Holy Ghost is then truly God, the Lord. To Ananias St. Peter says: "Why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost. \* \* \* \* Thou hast not lied to men, but to God."† To lie to the Holy Ghost is therefore to lie to God, and

\* Acts xxviii 25.

† Acts v 3.

the Holy Ghost is God. St. Paul asks the Corinthians: "Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?"\* The Holy Ghost in the heart of the Christian is God dwelling in his temple. And again: "Know you not that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own? For you are bought with a great price. Glorify and bear God in your body."† The Apostle then calls the body of the Christian, the temple of the Holy Ghost and the temple of God, as if the same thing, giving it to be known that the Holy Ghost is God. The Apostle also declares that whatever may be the diversity of graces, or of ministry, or of operations, there is but the same spirit, the same Lord, the same God, who worketh all in all.‡ And to the Holy Spirit in various places the Scriptures attribute all the attributes which pertain to God. Hence, Christians have at all times confessed the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and glorified Him with the Father and the Son, distinguishing the three divine persons, but not dividing the substance or essence in God.

*The Three Divine Persons are Distinct as Persons,  
but One in Essence.*

It is a doctrine of Faith that the three divine persons are distinct from each other. The Father is not the Son nor the Holy Ghost; the Son is not the Father nor the Holy Ghost; the Holy Ghost is not the Father nor the Son. Yet these three are not distinct as to the substance nor as to the absolute attributes, for all three have the same substance and absolute attributes—they are consubstantial, co-eternal, and co-equal in all things, because of the perfect unity of the divine substance which is common to them, and entire and individual in each of them. Without being confounded, they are united in the same substance, so that they are truly in

---

\* 1 Cor. iii. 16.    † 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.    ‡ 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6



each other. "I am in the Father and the Father is in me," says Jesus Christ. It is in the *personality* only that there is a distinction. The relative properties of *paternity*, *filiation* and *spiration* constitute the only distinction or difference between them. *Paternity* belongs only to the Father, *filiation* only to the Son, and *spiration* as received, or termed *passive*, only to the Holy Ghost. The Father is the principle from whom the Son from all eternity is begotten, and the Father with the Son is the principle from whom the Holy Ghost proceeds. It is a doctrine of faith, that the Son is begotten of the Father only, as expressed in the Creeds of Nice and Constantinople. It is a doctrine of faith, that the Holy Ghost proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, as from one principle, and one only spiration. Thus have the Fathers taught, and the Councils defined the doctrine as to the mystery of the Trinity. The Scriptures show this doctrine. Attributes belonging only to God are attributed to the Holy Ghost. "For the spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world." Wisd. i: 7. "They were filled with the Holy Ghost." Acts ii. These apply to Him what cannot be said of any one less than God. His operations can only result from the attribute of Omnipotence; he gives the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, the grace of healing, the working of miracles, the power of prophecy, the discerning of spirits, diverse kinds of tongues, the interpretation of speeches, all "operations which the same spirit, the same Lord, the same God worketh." 1 Cor. xii. Omniscience is attributed to him: "But to us God hath revealed them, by his Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth *all things*, yea the deep things of God." 1 Cor. ch. ii: 10. Again: "When He shall come he shall teach you *all things*." John xvi: 13. Supreme majesty and dignity must be reckoned to be his, from this declaration of the Saviour in Mark iii: 28. "Amen I say unto you that all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and the blasphemies wherewith they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, shall never

have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin."

Forgiveness of sin is an operation of the Holy Ghost, and who can forgive sins against God except God himself, either directly or indirectly? "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven." John xx. "You are washed, you are sanctified, you are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God." 1 Cor. vi. "Unless a man is born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii: 5.

He anoints, signs, and adopts the children of God: "in whom also believing you were signed with the Holy Spirit of promise; who is the pledge of our inheritance." Ephes. i: 13, 14. He diffuses charity: "Because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us." Rom. v: 5. He attends to the government of the church: "Separate me Saul and Barnabas, for the work whereunto I have taken them." Acts iii: 2. "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the church of God." Acts xx: 28. Here Christ is referred to as being God, and the Holy Ghost is declared to select and appoint bishops to rule the church of God. Numerous testimonies from tradition and the Fathers might be adduced to show that the Holy Ghost is God, consubstantial with the Father and the Son, but the Scriptures are clear enough on this doctrine to dispense me from citing other testimonies.

*The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.*

That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, as from one principle, is also proved from the Scriptures. Procession may be two fold; *immanent*, so called because its term remains within its principle; and *transient*, because its term is beyond or outside of its principle. The thought of the mind remaining in

it is an example of *immanent* procession. Procession may be *perfect* and *imperfect*. The perfect is when the term is subsistent, and of the same essence and nature with its principle. The imperfect, is when the term is not subsistent, as thought in the mind, or when it is not of the same essence with its principle, as the Son among things created. To deny processions in God, one must deny the Trinity altogether, but to determine the mode in which they exist in God is not easy. The Scriptures prove that there are in God two processions. Jesus Christ says of himself: "For from God I proceed." John viii: 42. "I came forth from the Father and came into the world." John xvi. 28. Of the Holy Ghost also he says: "When the Paraclete cometh—who proceedeth from the Father." John xv. 26. The council of Nice declares belief "in the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father." There must be among the three persons of the Holy Trinity an order of subsisting and operating, and this order is constantly indicated in the Holy Scriptures, which name the Father in the first place, then the Son, and the Holy Ghost after the Father and the Son, as in the formula of Baptism. Math. xxviii, and in 1 John v. This order is constantly observed in the doxologies and symbols of the church. This order can have its reason only in the processions, because it cannot have it in the nature, essence, or substance, which is common and the same in the three divine persons. What therefore makes one to be distinct from the other is the relative opposition arising from the two processions, the first by generation; and the second by simple procession, called also, in the principle, *active* spiration, and in the term *passive* spiration. The generation of the Son is admitted by all who receive the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. There is dispute concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Catholic doctrine teaching that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, while the schismatical Greek church and others holding with it in faith, profess that he proceeds from the Father only.

There are different texts of the Scriptures, which prove the Catholic doctrine, and these are of three kinds.

Texts of the first kind in which the Holy Ghost is said to receive from the Son. When the Son by that itself which he receives from the Father proceeds from Him, it is certainly understood that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son when he receives from him; for one person in God cannot in any way receive from another but by proceeding from Him. Of the Holy Ghost it is said: "But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth. For He shall not speak of himself: but what things soever He shall hear, He shall speak." John xvi: 13. Again: "He shall glorify me: because He shall receive of mine, and shall show it to you." Ib. v: 14. And why he receives from Christ is declared: "All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine; therefore I said, He shall receive of mine, and shew it to you." Ib. 15. This shews clearly that there is nothing in the Father which the Son has not, except the relative opposition from the personality; but the active spiration, which is in the Father, has no relative opposition with the Son, and must be common to the Father and the Son as the principle of the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost therefore proceeds from the Father and the Son.

Secondly. Texts in which the Holy Ghost is said to be sent by the Son. It is evident that the mission of one person by the other supposes the procession of the one from the other. The Father is sent by no one; the Son is sent only by the Father. Now the Scripture teaches that the Holy Ghost is sent by the Son: "But when the Paraclete cometh—whom I will send you from the Father" John xv: 26. Again: "If I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him to you." John xvi: 7. When in the Scripture, it is said Jesus Christ was sent by the Spirit of God, this is to be understood of him as man, since as God his mission was only from the Father.

Thirdly. There are passages or texts which indicate the same truth, by saying that the Holy Ghost is the



Spirit of the Son: "And the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not." Acts xvi: 7. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. viii: 9. "God hath sent the Spirit of His Son into your hearts crying: Abba, Father." Gal. iv: 6. And in John xx. Jesus breathed upon his Apostles, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." "What," asks St. Augustine, "What other thing did that breathing signify, unless that the Holy Ghost proceeds also from Himself?" Fathers and councils teach this doctrine, yet its obstinate denial is one of the two chief obstacles to a return of the Greek church to Catholic unity. Without admitting that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son in conjunction with the Father, He could not be distinguished from the Son, as the relative opposition is what makes the distinction of the Divine persons from each other.

In the regeneration of men by baptism they are baptized in one name, but belonging to three divine persons: "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The Third person is therefore proved to be God by his very name. For only God is "The Holy Spirit," by excellence, being a pure Spirit, infinitely Holy, the source of holiness, and the creator of spirits. It is because each of the other divine persons has his appropriate designation that the term Holy Spirit is used to designate the third person, of the Holy Trinity, and especially, because it is his office to bestow sanctity on the souls who were purchased by the blood of the incarnate Son of God.

### *Of the Gifts and Fruits of the Holy Ghost.*

We have nothing in natural and sensible things to furnish us a comparison, by which we can be able to comprehend how it is that the Holy Ghost "is given to us," or "dwells in us," as in His temple; but we are told by theologians that there are certain supernatural qualities, called the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which God



gives, by infusion, to the Christian soul in the sacrament of confirmation, to render it obedient to the promptings and inspirations of grace, and to strengthen it for the spiritual combat. These are indicated in the eleventh chapter of Isaias, verse 2d, where, referring to Jesus Christ, the prophet seems in vision to behold what others afterwards really witnessed, when, on the banks of the Jordan, the Holy Ghost, in form of a dove, rested on the head of the Son of God: "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him: the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge, and of godliness, and He shall be filled with the Spirit of the fear of the Lord." These, though common operations of the three divine persons, are called the gifts of the Holy Ghost, because they proceed from the infinite love of God, and therefore are attributed to the Holy Ghost. The twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost are summed up in this passage of St. Paul: "But the fruit of the Spirit is, charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity." Gal. v: 22, 23. They are termed fruits, because they are effects and works which the Holy Ghost produces in us by means of the virtues, and especially by charity, which is the first mentioned by the Apostle, and which is as the mother and nurse of the rest. As the ultimate effort of the tree is the maturity of its fruits, which are the glory and crown thereof, so are the Christian virtues, operated by the Holy Spirit, the ultimate result and crowning glory of the supernatural power of man acting for his final end: "Fear God and keep his commandments: *for this is all man.*"\* As the tree is known by its fruits, so by these fruits, is a virtuous and good man known, as, on the contrary, a vicious man is known by the works of the senses and the flesh. "By their fruits shall ye know them," says the Saviour of men.

When we consider that the Holy Ghost not only pre-

---

\* Ecclesiastes xii: 13.

sides over the church, enlightens and directs her, and gives her fecundity for bringing forth the children of God; that He illustrated her origin by the promise and expectation of prophecy and the splendour of miracles, and continues to aid her always to uphold amid the world the light of divine revelation, the truth which only can make men free for time and eternity; but also that it is He, who enkindles in the hearts of individuals the fire of charity to God and the neighbour, who enriches them with gifts, and enables them to lift up their aspirations to heavenly delights and rewards, to produce supernatural works and virtues, to bear the cross, and resist the assaults of the devil, who, in a word sanctifies and justifies the souls whom Christ redeemed, we should be filled with love, and gratitude, and resolve never by our conduct "to grieve the Holy Spirit." Eph. iv: 30.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.—ITS MARKS, UNITY, SANCTITY, CATHOLICITY AND APOSTOLICITY.—THESE MARKS BELONG ONLY TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Jesus Christ died for all, and desired to provide salvation for all, by giving them the knowledge of the truth, and cleansing them from their sins. He wished to render them holy here in this world, and to elevate them to glory and happiness in the next. For most of mankind this work was yet to be done when he departed from the earth, and visibly ascended to take possession of his kingdom. But this work is supernatural and can only be accomplished by himself. He, therefore, in some effectual, although invisible manner, will prolong his presence on earth, and extend his influence to every part of it, by again, if we can use the term, incarnating himself in a great moral organism, a vast society or corporation, which is to be known as his

church. "God hath placed under him the whole church, which is his body."\* The church is then one, with Christ. "Christ is the saviour of his body," † which is his church. The church is Jesus Christ continuing the work of the salvation of men, by teaching his doctrines and applying to souls the aids and graces which he has provided in his sacraments. As Jesus Christ lived and taught the truths of his religion, so is his church his religion living and acting as well as teaching; the visible embodiment of Christianity. We speak particularly of his church on earth, established by him to aid him in his work of restorer and saviour of men, commissioned to teach men to know and observe his doctrines and commandments, and to minister and dispense his mysteries and graces.

This terrestrial church, or association, is the society which Jesus Christ founded on earth, and placed under a ministry by him chosen, and to which he promised that it should be directed and guided by the Holy Ghost, while fulfilling its commission to extend to all parts of the earth and to all generations of men, the influences, the graces, the truths of his religion, for reconciling men with God and conducting them in the way of truth, holiness, and salvation. After men die as members of this society they still belong to Christ, if saved, and are still members of his body; they belong to the church, and rank with those who are to be further purified in the next world, or with those triumphant in heaven, but they no longer are of his society or church on earth. For the departed, either the work has already been accomplished, or it is forever more impossible. They are either with the saints in glory, stopped for a time on the way to be further cleansed, or they are lost forever. But men on earth, if members of Christ, must be found "in his body," which is his church, and if not in this society believing and acting with it, they can neither certainly know the truths which he has revealed, nor profit by the graces

\*Ephes. 1: 22, 23. †Ephes. v: 23.

which he dispenses. The church is the continuator of his work as teacher and saviour; she is his voice, his organ, his representative; and as no one can come to the Father except through Christ, so no one can come to Christ except through his church.

As we confess that God made himself visible in Christ in the incarnation, so we believe that Christ manifests himself to the world in his visible church, which the apostle calls "the church of God,"\* because Christ is God. For the sake of men, God became visible and made himself man; and to save men, He clothed supernatural truths and mysteries with language, that they might be known to men; for their sake, he appointed visible men to preach these truths and mysteries; to suit men and profit them, he placed his graces in sensible ceremonies and rites, and commanded visible men to administer them, and said: "Upon," the chief or leader of these, whom he termed, "this rock, I will build my church."† It shall be "one fold under one shepherd," where the mere *unity* of the members shall convince the world, that I have been sent by my Father.‡ The church of Christ is, therefore, a visible society. How shall it be known and distinguished from all other societies? The Catholic doctrine answers from the creed: "*I believe one Holy, Catholic and Apostolical Church.*" These four marks, when found together, manifest the church which all ages have recognized and professed to be the church of Jesus Christ. They cannot be found together in any society, which is not the church of Christ. They are characteristics which grow up from that which they indicate, and they cannot be separated from the church which Jesus Christ founded for the benefit of "all nations, promising to be with it and to preserve it to the end of the world,"§ against "the gates of hell," or the efforts of its enemies to destroy it.

*Unity of the Church, the first Mark.*

It is certain that Jesus Christ speaks of his church,

\* 1 Tim. iii: 15. † Math. xvi: 18. ‡ John xvii: 21. § Math. xxviii: 20.



as one. "On this rock I will found my church,"\* not many churches. There can, consequently, be only one society, which is his organ and represents him: "One body and one spirit," as "there is but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism—there is but one God, the Father of us all."† The unity of the church is essential to its nature and to its end. The church is the Christian religion embodied, and in action under an exterior, visible form. The Christian religion is one, teaches to mankind *one* faith, aggregates men together under Christ, and makes them members of one household, termed by the apostle "the house of God." If a person is not a member of this one society, he is not in union with Christ, the head, because the head presides only over the members of the body. The doctrines, the spirit, the virtues of Jesus Christ are with his church, and cannot be claimed and dispensed by mere human societies and organizations. Hence, all christendom, except such as from interest or passion, were found separated from the society which Christ founded, has subscribed to the declaration of St. Cyprian: "He who leaves the church will not obtain the recompense of Christ. He is a stranger, a profane person, an enemy. No one can have God for his Father who has not the church for his mother.‡" Only one society has inherited the promises, the graces, and the merits of Christ. That society, which was in embryo under the patriarchs, and shown to the world amid types and figures under the Jewish dispensation, and, in fulfilment of promises and prophecies, was "*purchased by the blood of Christ*" on calvary, and being organized under the visible headship of St. Peter, received the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, in order to become as "a city upon the mountain," for the salvation of all the nations of the earth, is the only society that can truly claim to be the church of Christ. It is a doctrine of faith, that there is only one church

---

\*Math., xvi: 18. †Eph. iv: 5, 6.

‡Cyprian de Unitate Ecclesiæ.



of Christ. The church is one only, or else there is no church of Christ, says St. Augustine—" *Aut una, aut nulla.*"

*Sanctity, the Second Mark of the Church.*

*Holiness* or *sanctity* is a mark of the church. But we must remember that Christ did not give it to be understood, that all the members of his church would be actually holy. On the contrary, he compared his church to a net let down into the sea, and "taking fish of all kinds,"\* good and bad, and again to a field upon which, amid the good grain, the enemy had oversowed cockle or tare, and where both should be found growing together till the harvest, or "the end of the world."† Sinners, and even public sinners, will then be found in the church. Nevertheless, sanctity is a mark of the church derived from its essential nature, because the church is holy in its founder, Jesus Christ; holy in the end for which it was instituted, the regeneration and sanctification of men; holy in its doctrines, the revealed truths of God; holy in its means, divine grace dispensed in answer to prayer, and in the use of the sacraments; holy in its spirit, the spirit of God, the Holy Ghost, sent to the church to be its comforter, its counsellor, its guide, and to abide with it forever. Hence the church is different from a mere human society, and is emphatically *a holy society*, for it is "the spouse of Christ glorious, and without spot or blemish," ‡ the rib formed from his own side, and endowed with the influence *to sanctify* his children, having with her the means of giving holiness to all who desire it and seek for it, and who do not, by their want of dispositions, their disobedience, and their sins, prevent her fulfilling the mission given to her by her divine founder. Her members are all "cleansed by the laver of water in the Word of life,"§ and by baptism are regenerated and made holy. If they keep this sanctifying grace

\* Math. xiii: 47-49. † Math. xiii: 24-30. ‡ Ephes. v: 27.

§ Eph. v: 26.

and preserve holiness, they deserve the name of *saints*. And the church has always beheld numbers of her children, in all parts of her vast domain, though their lives were not illustrated by miracles, yet giving to their fellow men assurances of their holiness by their irreproachable and exemplary lives, and their endeavor to imitate the model of the christian, the saint of saints. So also can the church ever confidently refer to her numerous confessors, virgins, martyrs, and saints of both sexes and of every rank and condition of life, whom she has taught and perfected in holiness. She cannot keep men from abusing their free will, and trampling on the graces of God by transgressing his commandments, but she continues to reprove their wickedness, holds up to them the mirror of God's law, his promises of recompense and threats of punishment, and succeeds daily to convert sinners to repentance, and to wash them once more in the bitter and salutary waters of penance. Being the body of Christ, and the organ and instrument of his action on mankind, all the sanctity, to be found or that is possible among men, is her sanctity, and this shows that she is the church of Christ.

### *Catholicity the Third Mark of the Church.*

Since Jesus Christ died for all men, and established his church to apply the merits of his death to all men of all nations, it is clear that his church must essentially be *Catholic*, or universal. Catholicity is the unlimited extension of the one society of Christ to all parts of the world, through all succeeding time from its origin until the end. The church is established to be the mother, guide, teacher, and sanctifier of all the nations of the earth. The Christian is the Catholic or universal religion, and the church is the Christian religion living and acting for accomplishing the work of redemption by Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the Saviour and mediator of all men, and "the church is his body," and therefore a universal society, a Catholic so-

ciety, and this society must hold in the embrace of its unity all whom Christ recognizes as his members. "The church is one," says St. Cyprian, "though extended far and wide, and is further multiplied by the increase of her fruitfulness. As the sun has many rays, yet one light, and the tree many boughs, yet its strength is one, resting on the firmly clinging root; and as, when many streams flow down from one fountain head, though a multiplicity of waters seemed to be diffused from the bountifulness of the overflowing abundance, yet is unity preserved in the common source. Part a ray of the sun from its orb, this division of light the unity allows not; break a branch from the tree, once broken it can bud no more: cut the stream from its source, the remnant dries up. Thus the church, flooded with the light of the Lord, puts forth her rays through the whole world; yet the light is one, which is spread over every place, while its unity of body is preserved. In the luxuriance of her plenty, she stretches her branches over the universal earth, and spreads out far and wide her bountiful and onward streams. Yet is there one head and one source, and one mother abundant in the results of her fruitfulness. It is of her that we are born; with her milk, we are nourished; her breath is our life. The spouse of Christ cannot become adulterate, she is undefiled and chaste. She owns but one home; with spotless purity she guards the sanctity of one chamber. She keeps us for God; she appoints unto a kingdom the sons she has borne."\* This beautiful passage shows the true meaning of Catholicity as a mark of the church. The unity of the church expanded throughout the universal world, and forbidding the existence of separated and independent societies, which are compared to "the *adulteress*," because the spouse of Christ, or his church, "guards the sanctity of one chamber." As the church is established for all nations it must necessarily be a *Catholic* or universal society; but as God will not force individuals or

---

\* Cyp. de Unitate Ecclesie.

nations to receive his religion, but desires them to embrace it with faith, voluntary and meritorious, the catholicity of his church must, *in point of fact*, be a moral and not a physical universality, since numbers of people, and even at times nations, may, in pride and passion, exercise their liberty, and separate themselves from the church. But its catholicity of fact is its diffusion in greater or less degree, among all the nations and in nearly all the countries of the earth.

Its perpetuity, or extension through time, is also clearly promised by Jesus Christ—"The gates of Hell shall never prevail against it." "I am with you ALL DAYS till the consummation of the world."\* "I will pray my Father, and he will send you another comforter, who will remain with you FOREVER."† Time can never destroy the church which is intended to be the ark of safety to all nations. It is, as some one has well remarked, "*the vessel which fears no tempests.*"

#### *Apostolicity, the Fourth Mark of the Church.*

Christ established his church by means of men whom he selected, instructed, ordained and commissioned, and whom he termed his *apostles* or envoys. "As my Father hath sent me, I also send you."‡ Whatever the Apostles of Christ believed and taught, that the church of Christ believes and teaches, and this is *apostolicity* of doctrine. But the Apostles had a mission from Christ; and they in time entrusted the same mission to others; and thus the church of Christ always had an apostolic succession and mission. Therefore, as said by St. Paul, the church is "built upon the *foundation of the Apostles and the prophets*, Jesus Christ being himself the chief corner stone."§ The church then issues from Christ through the Apostles, and holds its ministry, its doctrines, its means of sanctifying men, from succeeding to the Apostles of Christ. No one has a right to preach who has not been ordained and sent,

\* Math. xxviii. † John xiv: 16. ‡ John xx: 21. § Ephes. ii: 20.



and no one has a right to preach another gospel than that given by Christ to his Apostles, and faithfully committed by them to their successors, to be, in turn, entrusted "to other faithful men."\* This mark of the church is made up of two elements, apostolicity of ministry, and apostolicity of doctrine. The bishops of the church are successors of the Apostles in the work of the ministry, and the doctrines of the church are apostolical in their origin, and handed down pure and unchanged. Apostolical succession in the ministry is a pledge and sign of a faithful tradition of the doctrines, given to the Apostles by Jesus Christ to be taught to all nations *till the end of the world.*† Either the church of Jesus Christ must be interrupted and fail, or it must be perpetuated by succession. If it fail not, but continue, it must be always able to show, that its ministry, for Christ, has its undisputed succession from the Apostles, who received it from Christ. And thus, it must cease to exist, or continue to have the mark of Apostolicity. But, having the apostolical succession in the ministry, it must also possess it in its doctrines, for the ministry was instituted for the preaching of the doctrines of Christ, and for applying his merits and means of sanctification to the souls of men. Hence apostolicity is an essential mark of the church of Christ.

*The Roman Catholic Church alone possesses the whole of these Four Marks together.*

No other society pretends to possess these marks. Because they *do not* possess them, they maintain that they are not necessary. But the church of Christ must be clearly characterized and indicated to men by notes and features, which distinguish it from every thing else. Other societies, calling themselves the church of Jesus Christ, have no distinguishing and essential marks to make them known to the world. They all claim the

---

\* 2 Tim. ii : 2.      † Math. xxviii : 20.



*same* thing on precisely the *same* grounds, and yet differ from one another in their doctrines and ordinances. There is no evidence that any one of them is the church of Christ, and there exists no means to determine which of them ought to be regarded as his society. They do not "rest upon a rock," but upon the shifting sands of human caprice; they do not have unity of faith, nor are they expanded over the *universal* world in unity; they have not the means to *sanctify souls*, and are uncertain about the value of the sacraments which they profess to administer; and nearly all of them laugh to scorn the necessity of the *apostolical* succession, or where some pretend to it, by the evidence of history, they are proved not to be in the line. Their ministry is self sent, and their distinctive doctrines are made up of *negations* of doctrines which existed before their origin, and which have been perpetuated in the old society against which they protest. On the other hand, the four marks of unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity, are found together in the Roman Catholic church only, and clearly manifest her to be the church which Jesus Christ established, to be the means of the salvation of men.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH—ITS HIERARCHY—ITS INFALLIBILITY—ITS LEGISLATIVE AND COERCIVE AUTHORITY—THE POPE, THE VISIBLE HEAD OF THE CHURCH—THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH, OR OUT THE CHURCH NO SALVATION—ITS MEMBERS NOT TO VISIT THE RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLIES OF OTHER DENOMINATIONS.

Every society must have its constitution, or that which makes it what it is, and prevents it from being

something else different. The church of Christ is a visible, external society, and although composed of men, it was not founded by men, but it was constituted by God, and is "the church of God."\* Jesus Christ, God as well as man, calls it his church: "On this rock I will found my church,"† and his Apostle says that "the church is the body of Christ," meaning, not that it is his natural body, but that it is his mystic body.

But Jesus Christ being God and man, and the church being His mystic body, it is like its head in this respect, that it consists, at the same time, of that which is divine and that which is human. The end for which it is constituted being supernatural, viz.: to teach the revealed truth of God to all nations, to apply the blood of redemption by means of the sacraments to individuals, to keep its members together in unity of faith and communion, to prepare men by holiness for everlasting life, and union with God, it was necessary that it should be elevated far above the condition of a mere human organization. Its founder, consequently, gave it a divine constitution, with powers, authority, and force superior to any that a mere human society could aspire to or obtain, without receiving them from God himself. It is composed of pastors and people; a body, termed the clergy, to teach, guide and govern, the members of which are the ministers of Christ, his agents, his ambassadors, who by a sacred rite are ordained, and receive a distinctive character; and the people, for whom they are to labour, whom they are to instruct, to whom they are to dispense the supernatural aids purchased for them by Christ, and to be applied to them. Through his agents Christ designs himself to act, and thus the sovereign authority of Christ is represented, and exercised by this body, called "the Clergy," the Pastors, "the teaching church." The church herself declares that, in her hierarchy, there are three ranks, Bishops, Priests, and ministers, or deacons; but that the principals or chiefs are the Bishops, who are the successors

\* 1 Tim. iii: 15, and Acts xx: 28.

† Math. xxvi: 20.

of the Apostles, and that they are all one episcopate under the headship or principality of the Pope, who is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. The government of the church, as representing the sovereign authority of Christ its invisible head, is the body of bishops or chief pastors, with their visible head the Sovereign Pontiff, or the Pope. The mission to be accomplished by the church, demanded that she should be invested with the authority of Christ, to preserve, as well as to preach pure and unchanged the religion of Christ; for the church of Christ is his religion in action and, as it were, *incarnate*. The church then must always be the true, living expression of his religion, or Christ acting upon the people for their salvation. The church is the way and means of salvation, and can be the way and means of salvation only as the agent of Christ, and exercising his authority, a divine and not a mere human authority.

### *Infallibility of the Church.*

The church could not represent Christ in teaching the truths of revelation, and in presenting to mankind the standard of moral conduct, unless she were gifted with the prerogative of *infallibility*. If her teaching were different from that of Christ, and could be *false*, she would be unfit for her mission. Her mission is to teach the truths of the religion of Christ, and to sanctify the souls of men. For the fulfilment of her mission, she must teach with unerring certainty, and the Holy Ghost was promised and given to her to abide with her FOREVER, in order to enlighten, animate, and direct her in her work.\* It is true the teachers are only men, but Christ, who is with them as a teaching hierarchy, is God; the Holy Ghost is God; and these teachers are continuing the work of God for the salvation of men. The chief mediator is concealed, and the instrument is human, but the effect is to be produced

---

\*John xiv: 16, 26.

by *truth and grace*, and therefore the medium or instrument though human, must infallibly dispense truth and grace, in order to secure the effect. The infallibility is the attribute of the concealed mediator, Jesus Christ, but it is the prerogative of his church, as representing him. He continues to act through and with his church, for the salvation of men. "Behold I am with you all days" to assist you.\* This prerogative of infallibility is with the church in all that is necessary for the accomplishment of her mission. It does not give to individuals of the hierarchy exemption from sin, or guarantee that they may not lose their souls, but it insures to the people, who are taught and governed, a knowledge of the true doctrines of Jesus Christ, and of his precepts for the conduct of their lives. In the matters which pertain to faith and morals, they are made certain that they are taught and directed, without error or mistake, according to Jesus Christ, and his Holy Spirit. The persons who are taught, hear the voice of the church, the teaching of the body of bishops in union with the sovereign pontiff, as the voice of Christ, for Christ is with his church "all days," for the very purpose of teaching by her voice. When Christ was on earth, he seemed to be merely man, in all things appearing as man, yet he was God also, and he was infallible; so also the church, composed of men, seems to be merely a human society, but it is the church of Christ, founded by him, authorized by him, teaching and acting for him, and therefore it is more than human, it is divinely constituted, and has the prerogative to speak and teach for Christ with unerring certainty. But, as it must do this work until the consummation of the world, it can never fail or fall away from Christ, but is indefectible. Christ promised that error and crime or "the gates of Hell shall never prevail against it."† "For this cause," says St. Ignatius, "did the Lord take the ointment on his head, that he might breathe *incorruption* on the church."‡ "Hence we

\*Matth. xxviii: 20. †Matth. xvi: 18. ‡St. Ign. Ep. ad Ephes. n. 17.



may understand," says St. Jerome, "that even to the end of the world, the church may be indeed shaken by persecutions, but never can be overthrown; be tried, not conquered."\* And St. Augustine remarks: "There are some who say: 'she, that was the church of all nations, is already no more; she has perished.' This they say *who are not in her*. Impudent assertion! Is she no more because thou art not in her? Look to it lest thou, for that cause, be no more: for she will be, though thou be not."†

Although the term *infallibility* is not used in the profession of faith, made by those adults who are received into the church, and by members on certain occasions which require it, and it is not even used by the council of Trent in her decree, yet *that, which the term signifies*, viz: *inerrableness*, or inability to err or teach falsely, or to decide falsely, when judging and deciding the sense of the Scriptures, and proposing what is of faith, *is a dogma of faith*, to which no Catholic can refuse to assent without the guilt of heresy. It is of faith, that the church proposing the faith cannot err on account of the assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to her,‡ for "it is impossible for God to lie."§ The council says: the Holy synod "decrees that no one relying on his own skill, shall, in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrines,—wresting the sacred Scriptures to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother church,—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures,—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."|| The profession of faith says: I profess that I believe the authority of the Apostolic and Ecclesiastical traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret, and understand only in the sense which

---

\* St. Jerom. in Amos. † St. Aug. on Ps. ci. ‡ John xiv: 16—26 and xvi: 13. § Heb. vi: 18. || Sess. IV. Decree on the use of the sacred books.



our holy mother, the Catholic church, has held, and does hold." The unerring authority of the church, in the order for which it was conferred, can only cease to belong to her when she ceases to be the church of Christ and to have with her the Holy Ghost who was promised to be with her forever, or always.

*The Legislative and Coercive Authority of the Church.*

The church, being a permanent, constituted society, subjected to a hierarchy, has received from Christ a spiritual power to govern its members. The power is invested in the body of pastors united under their head, the pope, and is commensurate with the mission given to the church for the salvation of men. It is a tenet of Catholic faith, that this spiritual power is independent of the civil power, and that Christ gave authority to his church to pass laws for the spiritual welfare of the members, and to punish, with lawful censures, those who rebel against them. These laws are binding on the members; and the spiritual penalties, when really deserved, will be enforced by God, whose authority is invested in his church. While the sacrifice of the new law and the sacraments in their essentials have been established by Christ himself, he has left to his church to pass the laws, which regulate the liturgy, the sacred rites of worship, the ceremonies pertaining to the administration of the sacraments, the institution of ministers in the offices of the church, the abstinences and fasts, the observance of Sundays and feasts, the conditions of vows, and of the rules of religious orders, and what generally pertains to ecclesiastical discipline. And the ecclesiastical penalties are, like the powers, *spiritual*, such as excommunication, suspension, interdict, privation of sacred functions, or of a spiritual office; privation of the sacraments, deposition, degradation, and such like.

*The Pope the Visible Head of the Church.*

Jesus Christ, in constituting his church, chose his twelve Apostles, and made St. Peter the chief or head. To him he gave "the keys of the kingdom of heaven,"\* and under him placed the whole of his sheepfold, "the lambs and the sheep."† It is a tenet of Catholic faith, that the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, is the head of the body of pastors, and visible head of the whole church. The Pope has not only the primacy of honour, but also of jurisdiction, or authority and power, over the whole body of bishops, and the whole visible church, and not by the result of circumstances, not by usurpation, not by concession of kings and nations, but by divine right, and by the express institution of Jesus Christ. In virtue of his primacy, the Pope convokes and presides over general councils, confirms their decrees, and decides with authority in matters of faith and morals. He enacts laws which bind all the members of the church; and appoints bishops, assigning to them a portion of the vineyard of the Lord, or of the flock of Christ, and governs the whole flock, bishops, priests and people.

Whether the Pope, teaching as vicar of Christ, and *ex cathedra* in matters of faith and morals, is protected from erring by a certain divine assistance, or, as it is termed, is infallible, is not a settled point, some theologians having maintained that he is not, while others have contended that he is infallible. All agree that speaking unofficially, and as a private doctor, he does not possess this prerogative. But no point of his teaching as head of the church, or *ex cathedra*, has been disputed by the body of bishops. And to any one who will impartially meditate on the institution of the church, on the promises of Christ to St. Peter, on the duty of his office to "confirm his brethren,"‡ and also reflect on the vast responsibility of the office of head of the church,

---

\* Math. xvi: 18, 19. † John xxi: 15, 16, 17. ‡ St. Luke xxii: 32.

it must be manifest that Christ, for the preservation of truth and the welfare of souls, has really bestowed upon the Pope, as his representative and vicar, this high prerogative in all his official teaching on matters of faith and morals. Upon this point there has been no decision given by the church, and therefore persons can choose the opinion which appears to have for it the best reasons and arguments.

The following will show what all have to hold as of faith with respect to the authority of the Pope and the primacy of the Holy See:

“I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman church as the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontif, successor of Blessed Peter prince of the Apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.”—*Creed of Pius IV.*

“The Holy Synod furthermore exhorts and, by the most holy advent of our Lord and Saviour, conjures all pastors that, like good soldiers, they sedulously recommend to all the faithful all those things which the Holy Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches, has ordained, as also those things which, as well in this council, as in the other œcumenical councils, have been ordained, and to use all diligence that they be observant of all thereof.”—*Counc. Trent, Sess. xxv: p. 278, Watterworth's Translation.*

The council of Florence makes the following definition: “We define that the Holy Apostolic See, and the Roman Pontif hold the primacy over the whole world, that the Roman Pontif is the successor of Blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, that he is true vicar of Christ and head of the whole church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and to him in Blessed Peter was delivered by Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church, as is also contained in the acts of œcumenical councils, and in the sacred canons.”—*In Bulla Eug. IV. “Lætentur Cæli.”*

“Also the Holy Roman church itself obtains supreme and full primacy and principality over the whole Catholic church, which he recognises truly and humbly that

it received, with plenitude of power, from the Lord himself in Blessed Peter, the prince or head of the Apostles, whose successor is the Roman Pontif."—*Profession of faith of Michael Palaeologus, as offered by him in the second general council of Lyons, in 1274.*

*The Necessity of the Church, or out of the Church, no Salvation.*

Jesus Christ says of himself: "I am the way, the truth and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me."\* Jesus Christ is the head of "the church which is his body," and hence the church is bound to say: "no man cometh to Jesus Christ but by me." The church must maintain that she is *necessary*, and that no society, which men may organize and dignify with the name of church of Jesus Christ, will answer instead of her. She is forced to maintain that men cannot do without her, and cannot obtain salvation if they wilfully separate, or stay separated, from her. The church is the religion of Jesus Christ organized and living, and is consequently *the way of salvation*. To deny this truth is the same as to repudiate all divinely revealed religion, and to pretend that there is no fixed "house of God," no "column to uphold the truth," no defined way by which men can know and practice the doctrines of Jesus Christ.

All Catholics have to assent to this doctrine, that the church of Jesus Christ, one, holy, catholic, and apostolical, is the necessary and indispensable way of salvation, and that no person, who is *wilfully* separated from this church, can be saved. As St. Cyprian says: "He, who has not the church for his mother, cannot have God for his Father."† Again: "Whosoever he be, and whatsoever he be, he is no Christian, who is not in Christ's church."‡

A person, by his own will, being out of the church

---

\* John xiv: 6. † Cyp. de Unitate. ‡ Cyp. Ep. LII. ad Antonianum p. 156.



of Jesus Christ, is out by *his own fault*. He believes differently from the church, and has not the one faith necessary. If he *obstinately adheres* to opinions condemned by the church, he is guilty of *heresy*. If he holds all that the church believes, but refuses to submit to her *authority*, he is guilty of *schism*, or of dividing the unity of the church. The Scriptures clearly say that those guilty of heresy, schisms, and sects, cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

If a person is out of the church by accident, and without will of his own, and without his own fault, he will not be for this condemned; and if he possess the conditions for salvation which God requires from one in these circumstances, God will not reject him for not being in his church, which he did not know, but of which, without any fault, he was ignorant. But such a person may be really of the church, by his dispositions, his good faith, and his endeavours, according to the lights and graces he has received, to do all that he thinks required of him by God. God, in his infinite mercy, will not allow such to perish, but, by means known to himself, will attract them into the way that ends in eternal life.

But such persons can only be excused for not being in external union with the church, as long as their good faith and their ignorance endure. They become culpable by a neglect to seek and enter the church, when God gives them light to suspect, or to know, that they are out of his church. All persons duly baptized, no matter by whom this sacrament was administered, are made members of the church of Jesus Christ, hence all infants, who are baptized, are children of the church. They continue in the church, after they attain the use of reason, until, with knowledge and by their will, they take part with heresy or schism, and become separated from the church. "We must," says Pope Pius IX. in his encyclical of December 9th, 1854, "We must, in fact, admit as of faith, that out of the Roman, Apostolic church no one can be saved, that she is the only ark of salvation, and that, whoever shall not have en-



tered will perish by the deluge; yet, on the other hand, we must recognize with certitude that those who, with respect to the true religion, are *in an invincible ignorance, do not carry the fault thereof before the eyes of the Lord*. Now, in truth, who, in his arrogance, will pretend to mark the limit of this ignorance, according to the character and diversity of peoples, countries, minds, and so many other things? We must leave to God to determine who are not in his church without any fault on their part, while we hold it as certain, that all who seek salvation through Jesus Christ, in order to secure it, are obliged to become members of his church, if it is in their power.

*The Members of the Church should avoid the Religious Assemblies of other Denominations.*

When any one reflects upon the evil of error and dissension in matters of religion, and considers for what end Jesus Christ instituted his church, and “purchased it with his blood,” he will at once feel that it is criminal, in one of its members, by word or example, to encourage those who belong to sectarian or separated churches, having their peculiar doctrines, prayers, and worship. The Apostle St. John says: “Whosoever revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God.” And he tells the faithful not to receive such, or say to them “God speed.” “For he that saith to him God speed, *communicateth* with his wicked works.”\* It is necessary for the members of the church openly to confess their faith: “This is the word of faith, which we preach, that if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For, with the heart, we believe unto justice; but, with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.”† “Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, I

---

\* 2 Ep. St. John, 9—11 † Rom. x 8, 9.

will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven."\* The external profession of the word of faith is an obligation: for to believe is not sufficient, when the external conduct conflicts with this faith: For, "not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."† A person may deny his faith, and thus deny Christ, as well by means of signs, actions, and general conduct, as by words. "If a man should lose his life for Christ's sake," we are assured that "he will thereby save his soul," for this, *by his conduct*, is a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, and love for him. But it is never lawful, even in order to *save life itself*, to do any act in contradiction with faith in Christ; for thus a man will lose his soul, which is more valuable than all things else together. If he cannot be allowed to do such acts to save life, it is of course far more criminal to do them for less imperious reasons. Then what are we to think of persons weak enough to act thus from curiosity, indifference, human respect, or still more ignoble motives? If a person, by his way of acting, impugns the truth of God; implies that doctrines, contrary to what God reveals and his church proposes, may be true; denies the absolute necessity and true claims of the church, by so conducting himself as to cause it to be supposed that he considers other churches as churches of God, and other doctrines as possibly Christian doctrines, and members of sects as really true Christians, no matter what their creed or condition; he as truly denies Christ as if he did so in as many words, and is guilty of the grievous sin, which the Apostle St. John calls: "communicating with the works," of those, of whom Christ said, "beware," and whom St. John himself cautions the faithful to "avoid."‡ The command to beware of them, and to avoid them, regards particularly the affair of religion, for in mere social or political matters, there is not the same necessity, and

\* Math. x: 32.

† Math. vii: 21..

‡ Tit. iii: 10.

“unless men went out of this world”\* altogether, they must need hold communication with persons of all shades of religious opinions, for temporal affairs. But for religion, there is no such necessity, and the prohibition is to be observed under pain of sin.

“We charge you, therefore, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly” (contrary to established order) “and not according to the tradition which they have received from us.”† Order requires obedience to those “appointed by the Holy Ghost to rule the church of God.” The faith is one, the body is one, the authority is one, and it is “disorderly,” to set up another authority, or to constitute another body or church, and to bring in doctrines opposed “to the tradition.” It is the Apostle’s express injunction, “to withdraw” from all such. He gives this command, “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” For he asks in another place: “Know you not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump?”‡ “Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who cause dissensions and offences *contrary to the doctrine which you have learned*, and to avoid them.”§ This is a command, in form of an earnest entreaty, to do their acknowledged duty, and avoid all who cause or keep up dissent from the received and delivered doctrines of the church. If such persons are not in unity of belief, or not in unity of communion, this is enough to make it a duty to avoid them. And certainly, the most liberal interpretation of such a command would be, to say, at the very least, that they should be avoided *in all matters of religion*. If not extended to this, the injunction means nothing at all. There are many reasons for this law.

1. The fear of perversion is one reason for it. “Take heed that no man seduce you, for many will come in my name, saying, “I am Christ, and they will seduce many.”|| “Beware of false prophets,” says the Sa-

---

\*1 Cor. v: 10. †2 Thess. iii: 6. ‡1 Cor. v: 6. §Rom. 16, 17.  
||Math. xxiv: 4, 5.

viour, that is, *avoid them*, do not listen to them. "Let no man deceive you with vain words. For because of these things cometh the anger of God upon the children of unbelief. Be ye not partakers with them."\* You may think that you hear an eloquent discourse, very beautiful indeed, and well delivered, but what does it amount to but "vain words," if from "the children of unbelief?" And you may be "deceived," and invoke upon your head "the anger of God," who perhaps may permit you fondly to believe some opinion no better than "old wives fables."

2. The giving of *scandal* is another reason. Religious indifference is the great evil of the age. The notion that any creed and any church will take a man to heaven, and if so, that a man can just as easily get there without church and creed, seems to be fashionable; and this false and fatal notion receives encouragement from the Catholic, who goes to the religious assemblies of the sects. Besides, his going, if he be of any standing and influence, is an *example*, which weaker and less instructed members may imitate to their ruin. It is the sin of scandal.

3. It is, to say the least, a *seeming* denial of the faith, and of the exclusive right of the church to be regarded as the church of Christ. If the other churches are not true churches, why encourage them by your presence? If they are true, then the Catholic church has no right to the exclusive claim of being the Church of Christ. But your going to them is a decision against her claim. You then deny her, and if she is Christ's church, *as you profess*, you thereby deny Christ. In some places, for a Catholic to be seen at some other place of worship, is by all considered as equivalent to abandoning his church, or at least, to be a sign that he is not very firm in his faith. We are told, that the virtuous Eleazer would not save his life by *seeming* to do what his persecutor required contrary to the law of God, although in reality his friends offered him the opportuni-

\* Ephes. v. 6. 7



ty to avoid breaking the law, while seeming to do what the heathen king commanded. He preferred rather to die than dissemble, and thus give scandal to persons younger, who might think his dissimulation could be imitated, and "he preferred a glorious death to a hateful life." 2 Machab. iv: 19, 20, &c.

If the mere attending other places of worship be wrong for a Catholic, how grievously sinful is it to take part in the worship, prayers, and other religious functions; to conform and act as if a member of such church! This is emphatically the sin of "communication in divine things" with those not of the household of the faith. The translators of the New Testament, published first at Rheims, say in a note: "That in matters of religion, in praying, hearing their sermons, presence at their service, partaking of their sacraments, and all other communicating with them in spiritual things, it is a great and damnable sin."

The ancient Apostolical canons have the following: "If any bishop, priest, or deacon, shall join in prayers with heretics, let him be suspended from communion." Can. 44. Again: "If any clergyman or lay person, shall go into the synagogue of the Jews, or the meetings of heretics, to join in prayer with them, let them be deposed and deprived of communion."—Can. 63.

The Council of Carthage, held in 398, thus speaks: "None must either pray or sing Psalms with heretics; and whosoever shall communicate with those who are cut off from the communion of the church, whether clergyman or layman, let him be excommunicated."—C. iv: 72, 73.

To the English Catholics, in times of the existence of the penal laws requiring them, from time to time, to go to the law-established church, Pope Paul IV. wrote, commending their constancy in the faith in spite of calamities and tribulations, and among other things, he thus wrote: "Urged by the zeal of our pastoral duty, and from the paternal solicitude with which we daily labor for the salvation of your souls, we are forced to admonish and conjure you, that on no account,



you go to the churches of heretics, or hear their sermons, or join in their rites, lest ye incur the wrath of God, for *it is not lawful for you to do such things, without dishonouring God, and hurting your own souls.*" This will apply to Catholics of all places and times. Though many, either thoughtlessly or with indifference, act contrary to the divine commands, and the laws of the church, and frequent other places of worship from curiosity, fashion, or for the sake of friends, let them feel assured that they never do this without sin, and that they will have to give an account to God for exposing their faith, and giving scandal, as also for seeming to approve separated churches.

The same principles and reasons show that it is sinful to write, print, publish, sell, or read books, that are contrary to faith and morals. The ecclesiastical authorities have continued, from the days the converts burned their books at the feet of the Apostles, as narrated in Acts xix., to exercise censorship over books, and, under severe penalties, to prohibit such as were found false, or dangerous to virtue. The members of the church are bound to respect such censure and prohibition, under the risk of sin and excommunication.

---

## CHAPTER X.

### OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION—THE OLD TESTAMENT—THE NEW TESTAMENT—TRADITION.

The truths which we are to believe, and the morals which are to govern our conduct, are made known to us by the revelation of God. This revelation is known as *the word of God*. God has spoken to men in two modes, viz: by the way of written books, and by Tradition. The written books are called the *sacred Scriptures*, or the *Scriptures*, and, in their collection, *the Bible*. But many divine revelations were delivered orally.

as well under the old dispensation as under the new, or gospel law. Jesus Christ taught the divine truths of his religion to his Apostles orally, and he commissioned them so to preach them. Hence, his church, in teaching all nations, rests her teaching on the deposit of revelation as found in the Scriptures and Tradition. Her decisions in general council, or by her head in agreement with the bishops dispersed, define the points of Faith only, and do not make the doctrines.

The Scriptures are the collection of the divinely inspired books, which have escaped the injury of time, and have come down to us with complete genuineness and authenticity. They consist of the books of the Old and New Testaments, as avowed by the Catholic church. "What," asks St. Gregory the Great, "is the Holy Scriptures but an epistle sent by the Omnipotent God to his creatures?"\*

There are two testaments, the last the unveiling of the first. The difference existing between the Ancient and New law, may be summed up as follows: 1st, As to the author; the authors of the old law are especially Moses, and afterwards the prophets; the author of the Gospel is Jesus Christ, true God and true man. 2. The ancient law is less perfect than the new. 3. The ancient law is but the shadow of the new, the gospel is the manifest truth. 4. The ancient law was a law of fear; the gospel is a law of love. 5. The ancient promised terrestrial and perishable goods; the gospel promises grace, heaven; and it conducts to it. 6. The law was a galling yoke; the gospel is a light burden. 7. The law was a road leading to Jesus Christ and the gospel; the gospel and Jesus Christ are the term of the law, for Jesus Christ is the end of the law, as St. Paul says: *Finis legis Christus*. (Rom. x.) 8. The law was given to the Jews only; the gospel is given to all nations. 9. The law was only for a time; the gospel shall last forever; it shall be eternal. 10. The law was imperfect, the gospel is perfect, whether considered as

---

\* Lib. iv. Ep. lxxxiv.

regards doctrine or morals. 11. The ancient law was a law of servitude; the gospel is a law of liberty, of the spirit, of beneficence and charity. 12. The law gave only the precepts and what was conformed to nature; the gospel gives precepts and counsels, divine and supernatural things, surpassing nature. 13. The law proposes to the understanding the command in its barrenness; the gospel, with the precepts and counsels, offers grace for the accomplishment of both. 14. The law never created an Apostle; the gospel has produced many of them.\*

The books, which the Catholic church holds as the inspired word of God, and places in the *canon* or *catalogue* of inspired writings, are seventy-two in number, of which forty-five belong to the Old, and twenty-seven to the New Testament.

The books of the Old Testament are; the five books of Moses, viz: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; then Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 4 books of Kings, 1st and 2d of Paralipomenon, First of Esdras, and the second of Esdras or Nehemias, Tobias, Judith. Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias including Lamentations, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habaccuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, and 1st and 2d Machabees.

The books of the New Testament are: the four gospels, or St. Mathew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John. The Acts of the Apostles, the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, viz: Romans, 1st and 2d Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews, two Epistles of St. Peter, three Epistles of St. John, St. James, St. Jude, and the Apocalypse of St. John.

Although some of the books of the Old Testament are termed *Deutero-Canonical*, because not found in the

---

\* From Corn. a Lapide.

canon drawn up by Esdras, some of them having been written after his time, they are by the Jews read with respect, and by the Catholic church declared sacred and canonical. Also some of the parts of the New Testament were subject of discussion in the first ages, and more slowly admitted to be inspired, which shows how careful Christians were to examine the claims of these writings to be God's Word; and these disputed portions are also called *Deutero-canonical*; yet, in settling the Canon, the Catholic church has decided that they are, like the rest, sacred and canonical.

This is seen in the action of the Council of Carthage in 397, saying: "We receive these from our Fathers as to be read in the church." In 405, Innocent-I. to Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse; in 494, Pope Gelasius; and Pope Eugenius IV, in 1440, in his decree to the Armenians; give the list of sacred books as set forth by the Council of Trent. The Greek church agrees with the Latin as to the list of sacred and canonical books; and with the Fathers, it was regarded as the undisputed right of the church, to decide what writings are to be esteemed as the inspired word of God, since there were so many books in circulation claiming to be gospels and Apostolical writings, which were neither inspired, nor true. St. Augustine says: "I would not believe the Gospel did not the authority of the church move me to do so."\*

The decalogue, as given by God in the ancient law, was again in the new dispensation promulgated by Jesus Christ, and while by his advent, his life, and death, he fulfilled the figures and promises of the Old Testament, and abolished the ceremonial sacrifices and usages, he did not destroy the testimony, which the ancient Scriptures give, as to what in man is pleasing or displeasing to God; For his Apostle writes: "All Scripture, inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be

---

\* St. Aug. Cont. Ep. Manichaei, c. v. Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiae Catholicae commoveret auctoritas.

perfect, furnished to every good work."\* What is true, must be always true, for as Cicero says: "Truth is the daughter of time."† The truths, shown to men in the revelation of the Old Testament, must harmonize with those revealed in the New, for the gospel is the word of God from eternity. "The book of the holy Scripture is one," writes Rupert the Abbot, "and is therefore so called; it is one book because it is written by one spirit; it is one treasury and one tabernacle of the word of God."‡

The council of Trent declares the faith on this subject. It says: "The Synod, following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both."§

It is therefore of faith that the several books of the Old and New Testament are the inspired word of God, and as the Council pronounces *anathema* on any one "who does not receive, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire, with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition," it is fair to infer that by calling them *sacred* "in all their parts," it intends to maintain that "in all their parts," they are the inspired word of God. But the Council has not expressly said that "in all their parts" they are the inspired word of God, but that they are "sacred and canonical."

We present the following considerations to show the truth of the Bible, not with the intention of setting forth the many arguments which might be adduced, but in a mere general way, following the views presented in the book of Argentan, entitled "*Grandeurs de Jesus Christ.*"

---

\*2 Tim. iii: 16, 17. †Cic. Lib. de Offic. ‡In Apoc. §Sess. iv.



*1st.—Of the Old Testament.*

1. The Old Testament is anterior to all other books. No one has ever known or written anything more ancient. It alone gives an account of the origin of the world, teaches us whence it came, and who created it as it is. It presents to us the Creator, in his stupendous work of six days or periods—shows the earth's inhabitants, and what they did. We have nothing which precedes this narrative.

2. Moses, who wrote the first five little books, known as the Pentateuch, was not a cotemporary of all that he relates, but he was sufficiently near to the events, to have credible witnesses, who themselves saw a part and obtained the rest from their fathers and ancestors. Though the period was over two thousand years, the chain of tradition is short, clear and strong.

Before the deluge the life of man was prolonged for eight or nine hundred years, and consequently children lived so long with their parents, as to be able to learn from them correctly all they knew of the traditions of our race, especially, as they had little, in the order of the sciences and arts, to occupy their attention. The children, in their turn, becoming parents and living long with their children, even for centuries, could easily teach them all these great events. Thus only a few generations intervened between Adam and Moses, who could easily know what was generally known among the people, and in writing, would be necessarily able to record in his books the facts as known and believed, and not mere fictions or fables, the falsehood of which every one would know and denounce. His books were received with veneration, and preserved with religious care; because the people recognized their correspondence with the traditions of the past, and the facts of their own times.

3. The things related by Moses are not private affairs, but of a most public nature; events of the most extraordinary character, and in themselves seeming to

be almost incredible, had not all known them to be certain; so that, had they not occurred as stated, it would be easy to show the imposture. For how could Moses devise a fable, that the whole earth was submerged by a deluge, and narrate it as true, no one having any knowledge of such a catastrophe? How could he imagine and tell of the captivity of Egypt; the passage of the Red Sea; the manna sent down from heaven; the passage through the desert, and all the prodigies he has recorded, if he had to invent such events, since he tells them to those who ought already to know of them, and, if not true, would know that they were false and imaginary?

The events did not concern some few individuals, but whole nations and peoples, and the truth of them must have been known and admitted, or they must have been recognised as false. How could a writer, who was himself among the people, and held so high a rank, have published such extraordinary things as true, had they been fabulous?

4. Then the character of Moses and his admirable qualities deserve to be considered. 1st. He was a great prophet; 2dly. He was a very holy person; 3rdly. He was the intimate friend of God, and had special communications with him.

He predicted wonderful things, some of which occurred soon after, as he had foretold, others at a later period. His sanctity was recognized, and the acts of his life were wonderful; and God made known his will to the people through him. Such a man could not be wicked enough to fill his writings with fictions and falsehoods.

5. Then also consider how later writers, who have followed him, and added portions to the holy book, have written in the conviction of the truth of his writings. They too were prophets, and divinely inspired, and their prophecies in many cases were fulfilled while they yet were among the people. Their writings are sublime, containing grand and incomprehensible things.

and presented in a manner above the reach of the mere genius of man.

They also were holy men, they taught the principles of a holy life, and denounced the vices and sins of men; and most of them exposed or laid down their lives for the glory of God. These were the men who wrote the books of the Old Testament, and it is just to conclude that their writings must be authentic and true.

6. The preservation and integrity of the Old Testament, during so many centuries, is itself miraculous.

It always had numerous enemies arrayed against it. It censures the world and its vanities, menaces severe punishments against those who live according to the maxims of the world, and condemns Paganism and its hosts of imaginary deities. The world was devoted to idols and superstitions, and only a little portion held by the people of Israel worshipped the one only God; and yet these writings were preserved with care, and maintained their integrity amid this state of things; and the Jewish people cherished them with the greatest veneration and fidelity. How could this be, except that the Israelites were convinced of their truth and value, and that God himself watched over them as the records of his religion?

7. Consider finally that this book is not the work of one age, but of centuries—five or six centuries passed while it was being composed, and from Moses, who commenced it, to the Machabees, under whom it was completed, nearly twelve or thirteen centuries intervened, during which, a number of persons, of different degrees of intellect and condition of life, have added their parts to it, yet never could have seen each other, or compared their intentions and designs; and moreover, they all agree so perfectly in the truths which they teach, that it appears manifestly it was the Spirit of God who guided them. These proofs and reasons would seem sufficient, without having recourse to numerous others, to prove incontestably the truth of the writings of the Old Testament.

*2d.—Of the New Testament.*

1. If the writings of the Old Testament, which contain the shadows, figures, and types of the truths which God promised, are true, those of the New Testament are no less true, because they contain the realities pre-figured and promised in the Old. The two testaments have a close connection with each other, the one is full of promises, and the other narrates their execution. They are in fact but one book, at once the most ancient, venerable, and important in the world.

2. If the fact, that Moses was a prophet, and the other holy men who wrote the books of the Old Testament were prophets, gives such a character of truth to their writings, how much more firmly is the truth of the New Testament established by the fact, that the eternal Son of God made man, with his own lips dictated the greater portion of it, especially of the four gospels; while to those who wrote the rest, he not only gave instructions himself, but also visibly sent to them the Holy Ghost to inspire them? Their sanctity too is apparent not only from their holy lives, but from their many wonderful miracles, and from their having suffered death, in testimony of their faith.

3. As the witnesses cotemporary with Moses were so numerous and so able to be well informed, as to preclude all possibility of his undertaking to record fables for truths, especially events so extraordinary, that they must have passed as incredible, had not the truth of them been publicly recognized by men, how much more apparent is it that the Apostles and Evangelists could not have written untrue things, since what they wrote was so extraordinary, that men had never seen the like before—such as feeding five thousand persons with five loaves of bread, giving sight to the blind from their birth, raising the dead to life, as in the case of Lazarus, who was in the tomb for four days, curing the lame, and the palsied, and the lepers, &c.? To write and publish such things, in the very time and place



where they are represented to have occurred, is more than any writers could possibly venture to do, if the events were not true. The Jews were too much interested to confound them, to allow impostures so gross to pass upon the public unopposed and unrebuked. They could easily have confounded them, and they had every disposition to do so, were it not that they knew themselves that the facts were really true.

4. Besides the Apostles were not philosophers and learned men, but simple and unlettered, and instead of concealing what is humbling to them or to their master, they bring these prominently under view, and yet in their writings they set forth almost unconsciously the most sublime things, matters far above the reach of the human mind, and which have caused the admiration of the most learned men of all ages since. They had no education, and yet, they had scarcely abandoned their former humble occupations, when they at once astonish the world with a doctrine so spiritual and so perfect, that even the greatest philosophers are confounded in contemplating it; and, in the writings which record it, are forced to recognize a something which they discover nowhere else, a majesty which astonishes the mind, and a sanctity which affects the heart, even when they refuse to accept its lessons.

5. And although these Apostles were without personal credit or authority among their fellow-men, the whole power of the heathen world, and even its concentrated power under the great emperors who governed the world, succumbed before their teachings, and men accepted from them a new law, which subjected their pride and passions, their cupidity, and love of pleasures, and all that is dear to self-love and self-indulgence in man, and caused them to take up the cross of self-denial and voluntary mortification. It was a victory achieved by the truth, which they boldly and fearlessly proclaimed, and a victory, over such a mass of lies and errors as made paganism dear to the passions of men, is an indisputable evidence that the truth, which achieved it, came from God. There is no greater miracle, or



manifestation of the power of God, than this conversion of the Pagan world to the doctrines of the gospel.

6. But look at the character of the New Testament, and the work which it undertook as the censor of mankind. Consider the numerous enemies it had to encounter, and the empire of authority it has assumed, and always maintained over men, and say if you can explain its power and influence thus perpetuated, except by admitting that its authority is that of God. It censures and denounces all abuses, all depraved inclinations, all meanness, tricks, frauds, cunning devices—in a word, all the sins of men. It speaks alike to great and little—to kings and subjects—to masters and servants. It corrects the faults of all.

It not only condemns great crimes, but reproves little faults, and not only words and actions, but even criminal thoughts and desires. It looks into the secrecy of hearts, and unfolds the plies of consciences. At every point of conduct to which the passions may lead men in search of gratification, it presents itself with its text of eternal truth, to menace God's anger and an endless punishment, as the penalty of disobedience to its admonitions. Its voice no other can silence, and it is recognized as superior to any other in the world, which proves that it represents the authority of God. Heresy has tried to change and corrupt it, to make it suit its fond devices and theories of pride, and has even gone so far as to publish false writings with its title, as if they were genuine gospels, but it has still preserved its purity and integrity, without the loss of a single truth, and come down to us through the vicissitudes of time and change, unchanged and uncorrupted, while those altered writings, with the errors they upheld, have sunk into obscurity and oblivion.

7. The Old Testament demands the New, and makes it necessary. God might have dispensed with figures and prophecies, and given the redeemer to the world without them; but having given the Old Testament, and it being proved to be his revelation promising the saviour of men, as "the desired of nations," the simple

narrative of what occurred when God fulfilled his promises, and realized what he had prefigured, becomes a necessity; since otherwise the Old Testament would be still incomplete, and yet the time for the fulfillment as indicated by itself, long since have passed. The New Testament contains the realities promised in the Old, and manifests the realization as having taken place in time to correspond with the prophecies. They thus mutually prove each other. St. Paul tells us that he preached "the gospel of God which he had promised before by his prophets in the holy Scriptures."\*

Although both Testaments are but one book, and contain the word of God, it is a very great error to suppose that men can know God's word by a mere reading of the Scripture, as the Scriptures may be understood either correctly or falsely. It is evident that they express God's word to man, only when understood as he intended. But every reader, no matter how high an idea he has of himself, is not qualified to understand the Scriptures merely on reading, or even studying them. The Apostles themselves needed something more, as we see in St. Luke, where Jesus Christ "opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures."† Jesus Christ is still found in his church, and will still "open the understandings of men to understand the Scriptures," if they will take his interpretation of them, given by his church. The Scriptures are the book, seen by St. John the Evangelist, on the right hand of him that sat on the throne, "a book written within and without, sealed with seven seals," and "the lion of the tribe of Juda, hath prevailed to open the book and loose the seven seals thereof."‡ St. Augustine says: "In these Scriptures I am ignorant of more than I know,"§ for the profoundness of the Scriptures is wonderful. St. Peter declares that in St. Paul's epistles, "there are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned

---

\* Rom. i: 1, 2. † Luke xxiv: 45. ‡ Apoc. v: 5. § Epist. cxix.

and unstable wrest, *as they do also the other Scriptures,* to their own destruction."\* But the wise will seek the wisdom of the ancients, and, from the lives of the saints,† and the doctrines of the church, will learn the signification of the holy Scriptures, that they may do as Timothy was advised: "But continue thou in those things which thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee: knowing from whom thou hast learned them."‡ And if they "know the Scriptures from their infancy," like Timothy; so much the better, for they "can instruct to salvation," when "the things committed" are kept faithfully, and we continue in the "things we have learned" from the church, which was commissioned to teach us.

### *Tradition.*

Tradition, in its general meaning, signifies all doctrine communicated by one to another; whether by writing or orally; and in this sense it is used by St. Paul, when he says: "Therefore brethren, stand fast, and hold *the traditions* which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle."§

In its strict sense, it signifies doctrine communicated *orally* by its author, whether afterwards reduced to writing or not. Traditions may be divine or human, as they have Christ or the Holy Ghost for immediate author, or were introduced only by the Apostles from their general authority, or by the church after the time of the Apostles.

When we speak of *tradition* as a source or fountain of doctrines, we mean by it a collection of revealed truths, which, taught by men inspired by God, are preserved in the memory of men, in the principles of belief and conduct generally received, in the permanent and daily teaching of the ministers and chiefs of reli-

---

\* 2 Peter iii: 16. † Vita Sanctorum Interpretatio Scripturarum. St. Jerome Ep. ad Paulin. ‡ 2 Tim. iii: 14. § 2 Thez ii: 14.

gion, though not expressly written in the sacred books of Scripture.

It is very clear, that the men, whom God inspired, could deliver revealed truths as well orally, as deliver them in writing. It is also certain, that revealed truths have been orally delivered for over two thousand years from Adam to Moses; also from the time of Moses to that of Jesus Christ; and from the time of Jesus Christ to our day. The history of the Jews, and the history of the Church, prove this. We will speak of divine traditions during the period between Jesus Christ and our time. In this period, besides the Scriptures, or written word of God, there have always been in the Church *traditions*, or a collection, or *body of revealed truths*, which were orally taught by the Apostles and first disciples of Jesus Christ, and not by the writers of the Christian Scriptures expressed in them, but which belonged to revelation, and were as entirely the word of God, and source of doctrine as what was expressed in the Scriptures.

These truths were taught by the Apostles to the churches which they founded, and to the ministers, the bishops and priests, whom they ordained. As they themselves had been instructed by Jesus Christ, so they instructed the bishops whom they ordained; these, in their turn, instructed and ordained others. Thus the truths, orally taught by the Apostles, were preserved in the church as a sacred deposit, which was religiously transmitted from one to another, from Jesus Christ to us.

It is of Faith, that there exist in the church such divine traditions, and that these, as well those pertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, are to be received and venerated equally with the books of the Old and New Testament.

If the truths come from the same source and have the same high origin, of course they are entitled to the same belief and veneration. They must have the same authority.

The following texts are decisive upon this point: "And the things thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also."\*

"Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle."†

"Now I praise you, brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me, and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you."‡

For "ordinances" we have in the Greek, *paradosis* or traditions, in this last text. In the second, the Apostle places what is delivered by "word" and what by *writing* on the same terms. And in the first he indicates the method of teaching orally "to faithful men" the truths which he had taught, that they should also "teach others," as the means proper for propagating the doctrines of faith.

Timothy no doubt followed these instructions of St. Paul, and thus from hand to hand, age after age, was the deposit of doctrines passed from faithful men to others instructed by them. In this manner have the doctrines descended to our times, for the preaching of the gospel was the manner chosen by Christ, and in use before a word of the New Testament was written. The time assigned to the composition of the books of the New Testament embraces a period of about fifty-seven years, from the eighth to the sixty-fifth year after the ascension of Jesus Christ. Many years more elapsed before the collection of these writings into one volume; and near four centuries before the church settled the Canon. During this time tradition was the safe vehicle of doctrine; and the necessary interpretation of what was set forth in the inspired writings was the teaching and faith of the church. For the Saviour, being God, would not have allowed a false teaching to be first spread and believed, and then cause to appear writings in contradiction—a written gospel contrary to

\* 2 Tim. ii: 2.    † 2 Thes. ii: 14.    ‡ 1 Cor. xi: 2.



the preached gospel. St. John, in the conclusion of his gospel, tells us that all that Jesus Christ did was not written,\* and neither of course was all that he taught his<sup>e</sup> Apostles recorded. Their preaching and the instructions and rules, which they gave to the churches which they founded, were necessarily such as Christ commissioned them to teach to mankind, since he sent upon them, for this purpose, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth. Their preaching or traditions were, therefore, to be received with faith equal to what is due to inspired writings coming afterwards; and when these writings were silent on points which were in their traditions, the word of God could only be known from these last, and where the writings spoke on the same subjects as their traditions, and the writings would seem to bear another meaning or interpretation than the one which the Apostles expressly taught, it must be concluded that the interpretation which is in harmony with their traditions is the one intended by the Holy Ghost, since He could not have inspired them to preach one set of doctrines, and inspired them and other men to write doctrines opposite and contradictory. I say *other* men,

---

\* John xxi: 25. And not only was all not written, but even some of that which was written, has not come down to us. For instance, in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians he says: "I wrote to you in an epistle not to keep company with fornicators." 1st Cor., ch. v: 9; and where is this epistle, which the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians, as he informs us in what we now name his *first* epistle to the Corinthians, and which, therefore, was not the first? Again, in Col. iv., 16, St. Paul says: "And when this epistle shall have been read with you, cause also that it be read in the church of the Laodiceans; and that you read that *which is of the Laodiceans.*" And where is that epistle of the *Laodiceans*, to which St. Paul here refers the Colossians? Can reader<sup>s</sup> of the Bible find it?

While I am directing attention to what has been lost to us from the New Testament, it may be of interest to remind those, who place their confidence in the written word of God alone, as they understand it in their private judgment, that many books of the Old Testament are also wanting. Cotzen, in his preface to the four Gospels, estimates the lost books of the Bible at twenty in number. St. Justin Martyr, in his work against Trypho, says: "The Jews made away with many books of the Old Testament, that the New might not seem to agree with it." Here we indicate some of these lost books. In Numbers xxi. 14, we read: "Wherefore it is said in

because St. Luke and St. Mark were not Apostles. Therefore, the preaching of the Apostles and their successors, or the teaching of the church of Jesus Christ, must always remain the test for knowing the sense and meaning of what may be read in the Scriptures. Many of the Apostles delivered nothing in writing that has been preserved to the world. Even those of them, whose writings we possess, delivered many things without writing. "These things also," writes St. Chrysostom, "are worthy of faith. It is the tradition: ask no more."\* "If of these and similar traditions you ask for the law," writes Tertullian, "you will find no scriptures for them. Tradition will be pleaded to thee as the author, custom as the confirmer, and faith as the observer of them."†

---

the book of the wars of the Lord." But where are we to find this book? Again: In Joshua x. 13, it is asked: "Is not this written in the book of the just?" or in the *Prot. version*, "in the book of Jasher." Where is this book? In 1 Kings x. 25, or *Prot. vers.* 1 Samuel, it is said: "Then Samuel told the people the manner of the Kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it before the Lord." This book is lost. Again, in 3 Kings, or *Prot. version*, 1 Kings, it is said: "Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs, and his poems (songs) were one thousand and five." Where are all these proverbs and songs? Again in 1st Paralipomenon, or *Prot. vers.* 1 Chron. xxix. 29, it is said: "The acts of David, first and last, are written in the books of Samuel, the seer and the book of Nathan, the Prophet, and the book of Gad, the seer." Where now are the book of Nathan, and the book of Gad? Again in 2d Paralip. or *P. v.*, Chron. ix. 29, it is asked, speaking of the acts of Solomon: "Are they not written in the words of Nathan, the Prophet, and in the books of Abias (Abijah), the Silonite, and in the vision of Addo, (Iddo) the seer." These are lost books. Again in the same, ch. xii. 15: "The acts of Roboam, first and last, are written in the books of Semeias (Shemeiah), the prophet, and of Addo (Iddo) the seer, and diligently recorded." But where are these books? Again in the same, xiii. 22: "And the rest of the acts of Abia, and of his ways and works, are written diligently in the book of Addo, the prophet." And in chapter xx. 34, of the same, we are told that the acts of Josaphat are written "in the words of Jehu, son of Hanani, or in *Prot. vers.* in the book of Jehu, son of Hanani." Where is this book to be found? These books are no longer a part of the Bible, and he who relies only on the written word of God read and interpreted by himself, has only a part of God's word. Perhaps if he had some of these lost books, he might have to change some of his religious opinions.

\* Chrys. in Ep 8 Paul. † Tertullian de Corona.

“But there is also need of tradition,” says St. Epiphanius, “for all things cannot be sought from the Scriptures. Therefore have the most holy Apostles left some things in writing and other things by tradition.”\*

“Whatever,” says St. Augustine, “the universal church has held from the beginning, and was not instituted by councils but always retained, is most justly believed to have been no otherwise transmitted than by apostolic authority.”†

Many fathers, from St. Ignatius down, might be cited, but these suffice in conjunction with the plain texts from the Scriptures which we have given. Usage established the authority of tradition even with those, who pretend to deny it, where it conflicts with their peculiar errors. Denominations of Christians, whose members admit *infant baptism*, have a difficult task to prove it conclusively by the Scriptures; for though it is, in certain texts, insinuated, and implicitly taught, it is not said in express terms, yet they have received it from the teaching and usage of the church, on the authority of tradition. All denominations have in use the Sunday as the Lord's day, instead of the Sabbath as God commanded, and they cannot justify this change by the Scriptures, but they have received it from the Catholic Church, on the authority of tradition. They neglect “the washing of the feet,” commanded in the Scriptures, because the Catholic Church, on the authority of tradition, has not kept it before men as a precept or institution, although the Catholic Church, by her head at Rome, and, in many other parts, by others, has it yearly observed, on Holy Thursday. They make no difficulty to eat blood or things strangled, although expressly forbid to do so in the Scriptures, because the Catholic Church, on the authority of tradition, has declared that the prohibition was only a rule of discipline, designed for a particular time and circumstances, and not for all nations and ages of the Church.

---

\* Epiph. adv. Hær. lib. 11. Hær. 60. † De Bapt. Con. Don. l. i.

The Catholic church consistently declares that the authority of divine tradition as God's word, is the same as if the Scriptures contained the record. It is his word delivered, and of the same weight and value as his word written. And with as firm faith, she holds and teaches these points of tradition. But what consistency is there in people calling out daily "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," and then believing and doing things contrary to what is expressed in the Scriptures, and for which they can have no authority except Tradition, which they repudiate and condemn?

In every society, and the church is a great society made up of all nations, there must be traditions arising at the very origin of such society. The only question, for the church and its members, is, does such or such tradition come unchanged from Jesus Christ and his Apostles? Or has it, in its progress, been changed or altered? To this question reason answers: "Whatever is generally taught and practiced throughout the whole church, without any one being able to show that it commenced at some time later, must have come from Jesus Christ and his Apostles." For considering man's nature, and the nature of doctrines affecting the conduct of men, it is *not possible*, that the generality of Christians dispersed over all the different countries of the earth, and separated from each other by seas, by languages, and customs, different in manners and views about every thing except religion, could unanimously have fallen upon the same belief and usage in religion, if that doctrine and usage had not come to them from the same source, or from the same master, who had sent his envoys to these different people, with the same lessons and instructions.

Also to the reason of man it appears, that whatever is universally believed and taught over the whole church, without a possibility to show that it began at any time later than Jesus Christ and his Apostles, can *never* be easily altered, changed or corrupted, because both teachers and believers take too lively an interest

in matters of religion, to allow of such change or alteration designedly, and too continually reduce their belief to daily practice to allow an unperceived change to occur, not to say, that it would be impossible that either of such supposed alterations could ever be universal over the whole church, and no notice thereof appear in history.

Besides, such change in faith and usage would also have required an alteration of the books and writings of the Fathers and Doctors of preceding ages up to the days of the Apostles, since for the doctrines of the church, which *rest on tradition*, we have the testimonies of the Fathers and writers of every century up to the very times of the Apostles. How impossible is such a change! No better sign then can any one have, that a doctrine came from Jesus Christ and his Apostles, than its being held by the universal church at all times, without the possibility to show that, at some later period, it was introduced. A tenet believed at all times since the origin of Christianity, and believed every where, must have been taught by Jesus Christ himself, and by his Apostles according to his command.

The Holy Scriptures and Tradition must therefore be equally revered as the sacred fountains of the faith delivered by Jesus Christ.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### OF FAITH—THE RULE OF FAITH.

St. Augustine tells us, that “a man learns from the creed what is to be believed, from the Our Father what is to be hoped for, and from the commandments what is to be loved.”\* It is to what is to be believed, that I am chiefly inviting attention at present, and hence I

---

\* Enchirid. ch. 6, 7, 9, 117.



will leave the reader to seek elsewhere the teachings of "the Our Father" and "the commandments," respecting the objects of hope and charity. The creed is but the summary of the principal doctrines of faith, and these are set forth first, in the symbol called "the Apostles' Creed," and afterwards, with more development, in that of Nice, of Constantinople, in the Athanasian Creed, and that of Pius IV. But the creed does not present all that flows from the fountain of divine faith, or all that God has revealed and promised, as contained in the Holy Scriptures and tradition; and certainly faith can be nothing less than a belief of all that God has said, as far as it is known to us.

St. Augustine further remarks, that there are two kinds of faith: "We speak now," says he, "of that faith which we use when we believe something; not of that which we give, when we promise something. For this also is called faith. But it is one thing, when we say, he gave no faith nor credit unto me, and another, when we say, he kept not faith with me. For the one is as much as to say: he did not believe what I said: the other, he performed not what he said. By this faith, whereby we believe, we are faithful unto God; by the other, whereby that is performed which is promised, God also is faithful unto us. For the Apostle so says: "God is faithful who does not suffer you to be tempted above what you are able."\* Of the faith, or fidelity of God, no doubt can be entertained; it must therefore be held that whenever in the Scriptures, mention is made of man's faith alone, and in its own kind, it should be understood of that, whereby he is faithful to God, or as St. Chrysostom expresses it, of that "faith by which man gives credit unto God's sayings and words."† For explaining the words: "Abraham believed God," he says "he believed the sayings of God." He gave credit to God's words. "What pertains to faith?" again asks St. Augustine; he answers: "to believe." "But what is it to believe, unless to con-

\* Aug. de Spirit. et lit. cap. 11.

† Hom. 31, in Gen.

sent that what is said is true?" Faith, then, considered in its own kind, may exist alone and separate from hope and charity. Wicked men may have faith, for even "the devils believe and tremble," *but they neither hope nor love*, says St. Augustine. This faith is the assenting to and the believing of what is revealed. Of this faith the Apostle speaks, when he tells us, that "faith without works is dead." It is perfect in its kind, being really *believing*, but it is not a saving faith; because St. Paul declares: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; *but faith that worketh by charity.*"\* From this declaration of the Apostle, St. Augustine deduces the following rule, that when we find in the Scriptures faith commended for justification or salvation, we should always understand it to signify the faith which worketh by charity; † "for the Apostle hath defined and determined this to be the faith required." He who believes the word of God in his mind and professes it with his lips, but does not keep it in his actions, but transgresses its commands, will not be saved. His faith is true and perfect for believing, but not perfect for saving, for it is one thing to have the true faith in assent and profession, and another to have it in heart and affection, and with obedience and other necessary virtues. Faith alone may then exist, and does exist in wicked persons and in devils also, but will not avail without other things: "Without which," says St. Augustine, "it can be, but cannot profit." ‡ Yet this faith, which has its own natural and peculiar property of being an assent and belief of the mind to God revealing, though not sufficient of itself and when alone, is still necessary. We must give credit to God, and believe what he says, otherwise we impeach the veracity of God; and we cannot do this without the greatest impiety, even on the slightest points of what he says, for his veracity is, in all things, in little as well as great,

---

\* Gal. v: 6. † Aug. De fide et Oper. c. 14. De Spirit. et lit. cap. 32. ‡ St. Aug. de Trinitate lib. 15, cap. 18, et In Enchirid. cap. 8.

unimpeachable and unquestionable. However, to know what is said by God, we must understand his words correctly. What is said by God, or his word, as we have seen, is found in the Holy Scriptures and in tradition; but these are both without life and animation, and on account of this, cannot tell us when we understand correctly what they contain as God's sayings or revelation, and, consequently, numerous disputes and controversies arise among men, about the meaning of different passages of the Holy Scriptures, and about the fact whether such a teaching or usage belongs to tradition from Christ and his Apostles. To explain difficulties, and to settle disputes, it was necessary to have a living teacher, who is able to say when the word of God is understood in its true sense, and what traditions are of divine authority. God has provided this teacher and interpreter to settle all controversies in religion, and interpret his word with unerring authority, for it has been always held as certain, and is a tenet of Catholic faith, as declared by the council of Trent, that it belongs to the church "to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures,"\* in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine. For rule of faith, therefore, besides Scripture and tradition, we need the church to propose, declare, and decide what are the truths which we are to assent to and believe on the word of God, and because of his supreme authority. This is summed up in the following rule: "All that, and only that, is of Catholic faith, which God has revealed, and the church proposes to the belief of all."† That a doctrine should be of Catholic faith, first, it must be revealed by God; and secondly, it must be proposed by the church. The Apostles had the commission to teach to all nations the revealed truths of religion; their successors in the same ministry, or *the church of Christ teaching*, received authority to fulfill the same commission, and with the

---

\* Sess. IV. Decree on the use of the Sacred Books.

† See Ve-

ron de Regula Fidei Catholicæ.

promise of aid from Christ to the end of the world, and of aid from the Divine Spirit to suggest all truth to them, they were to continue to teach until all should have the opportunity to receive *the one faith*, which, says St. Paul, "cometh by hearing"\* those who are sent to preach it. He that refuses to credit this teaching, or "who believeth not, shall be condemned."†

Although supernatural, infused faith be one, as it is a habit in the soul, faith is by theologians represented as twofold, yet both of them equally divine, and termed Catholic faith and theological faith. They define divine theological faith, to be that, by which we believe God revealing the mysteries and truths of the Christian religion; and divine Catholic faith, that teaching which proposes to the universal church the things that are to be believed by all. Theological faith contains all the truths revealed by God, whether in his written or unwritten word; but for Catholic faith, the public proposition of the teaching church is necessary. A person, consequently, might before God be guilty of a heresy, in culpably denying or rejecting something by him revealed, and belonging to theological faith, without subjecting himself to the pains or punishments directed by the church, as he did not come in conflict with what she taught by express proposition.

Many articles of faith, formerly found in theological faith, have become of Catholic faith in the course of time, by definitions made by the church; while others, equally of divine faith, are believed in the church, and are not yet defined by express proposition.

The church does not make the faith, but expressly declares what it is, when the utility of the faithful and propriety of times and circumstances, require her to speak, as she does in her Œcumenical Councils, or through her head, with the agreement of the bishops dispersed over the world. When the Scriptures are obscure, her interpretation is to be received as the genuine

\* Rom. x: 17. † Mark xvi. 16.

sense thereof. Her public teaching always is in harmony with the Scriptures. If she has usages, which she declares to be apostolical traditions, these are to be held as harmonious with what is taught in the Scriptures. Every doctrine decided and proposed by her, is to be held as a Catholic truth, for her decision is infallible in matters of faith and morals.

By this rule, it can be known what are those heresies and sects, which the Scriptures declare to us will exclude their followers from the kingdom of heaven.

And though "faith cometh by hearing," yet the grace of God precedes its entrance into the soul; it is also itself a grace, but when it is alone, in its kind and nature as mere belief or assent, it is not a saving faith, but may become so, if working by charity, there is obedience to the laws of Christ, for the remission of sins in his sacraments. For though faith be a gift of God, it requires the co-operation of the will of man for salvation.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

CONCERNING GRACE—ITS NATURE—ITS DIVISIONS—ITS EFFECTS—FIRST EFFECT, JUSTIFICATION—SECOND EFFECT, THE MERIT OF GOOD WORKS—PREDESTINATION—THE CONDEMNED PROPOSITIONS OF JANSENIUS.

As some one has remarked, "the Christian religion is an immense *grace*." St. John the Apostle declares that: the Son of God was made man, and "dwelt amongst us full of *grace and truth*." His church and all his institutions are full of grace. What are we to understand by this term *grace*? It expresses the gifts which God gratuitously confers upon man, especially in the order of salvation, and may be defined: A super-



natural and gratuitous gift, from the pure goodness of God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, as the means to enable men to obtain eternal life. It is *supernatural*, because coming from God, its influence is to enable man to attain a supernatural end, the vision and enjoyment of God; and *gratuitous*, because God was not obliged to create man for a supernatural end; nor to elevate him to a supernatural end after he had fallen; and because it is a pure mercy of God that He restores man from his fallen condition, and invites him to seek the vision and possession of Himself, the Infinite Good, and offers to make him partaker of the glory of heaven:

Since the fall of Adam, grace comes from God to man only in view of **THE MERITS OF JESUS CHRIST, THE REDEEMER**, who purchased it by making himself a victim of propitiation for all the human race. Towards attaining everlasting happiness, men can do nothing without the grace of God, although their natural forces are only impaired, and not entirely ruined by the fall of Adam.

Grace is divided into habitual and actual grace. The first, which is also called *sanctifying* grace, is a quality, which in a fixed and permanent manner, abides in the soul, purifies it from sin, and renders it agreeable to God and worthy of the happiness of heaven.\* It remains in the soul as long as the soul perseveres in justice, but it is lost by mortal sin. The second, or actual grace, may be either external or internal. Exterior

---

\* It is of faith that *sanctifying* grace which justifies exists; it is also of faith that it is *inherent in the soul*, and not the mere favour of God and extrinsic, but theologians say that it is not of Catholic faith, that it is in the soul in the form of a habit, or *habitual*, because neither the Council of Trent nor any other general council has defined it to be a habit. Yet it is the common opinion of theologians that this justice or sanctity is a permanent quality or habit in the soul. Vasquez says: "From the definition of Trent it is collected with manifest reason, that infants and adults, who obtain the remission of their sins by virtue of the sacrament, are justified by a habit, and a permanent quality, and therefore that this opinion so pertains to Catholic faith that it cannot be denied without error."—*Disputation* 203, cap. 6.

grace consists in the preaching of the gospel, sermons, exhortations, counsels, good examples, and the like, which incline the soul to good. Interior grace, considered as *actual*, is the act of God interiorly enlightening our understanding and fortifying our will, and thus is either grace of the understanding, or grace of the will. This grace may be either preventive, concomitant, or subsequent, according as it induces us to know and will good, or aids us while we do so, or follows us to make us *persevere* in willing and doing good.

Grace may be also either sufficient or efficacious. It is *sufficient*, when it gives us the power to do good, although it is not followed by its effect. And it is *efficacious*, when it is followed by its effect, or where with it we do what God wishes us to do.

Men can resist grace, and when they do resist it, and it does not produce its effects, such grace theologians term *sufficient*, to distinguish it from grace which is not resisted, but corresponded with, and which, producing its effect, is termed *efficacious*. But it is a doctrine of faith, that although efficacious grace infallibly produces its effects, it does so without reducing the free will of man under any necessity, but leaves it truly free, and able to resist the influence of grace.

Theologians distinguish grace in general into two sorts, one of which they term *grace given gratis*, *gratis data*, and the other *grace making agreeable*, or *gratum faciens*; for although all grace is a gratuitous gift, they specially term that grace *gratis data*, which God gives to a person not precisely to sanctify him, but to convert and sanctify other men, such as the gift of miracles.

The second sort, or grace *gratum faciens*, is also a gratuitous gift of God, but its object is to render the person to whom it is given holy and agreeable to God. To this kind of grace, our attention is now to be restricted.

It is an article of faith that *actual interior grace* is absolutely necessary for salvation; for the commencement, the increase, and the perfection of faith; for the beginning and completion of good works; for the commencement and consummation of our salvation.

“Without me you can do nothing,”\* Jesus Christ has said in the gospel, and St. Paul speaks thus: “not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, as of ourselves; but our *sufficiency is from God.*†” Again: “Being confident of this very thing, that he who hath begun a good work in you, will perfect it unto the day of Jesus Christ.”‡ Also: “For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is *the gift of God.*”§ “For unto you it is *given* for Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for him.”||

Grace is therefore necessary for all that relates to salvation, and in all respects it is gratuitous; men “being justified freely,” by the grace of Jesus Christ. Yet we are to keep in mind, that the greatest of graces for us, “eternal life,” is promised as a recompense for our good use of other graces, and therefore men having grace, may merit other graces. The sense in which we must understand that grace is *gratuitous* is, that it is a free gift of God, and can never be merited by the natural efforts and natural dispositions of man, though when man is moved by God, and *assisted by his grace*, he may, by corresponding with grace, merit and receive other-graces, so that God, “in recompensing good works in man, is always crowning his own graces.”

Yet it is of faith, that actions, performed by a man before justification, are not all bad actions. Nor are all the actions of sinners criminal in the eyes of God, since the sinner, before being forgiven and justified, may, *under the influence of grace*, do actions which lead to his conversion and return to God, and to this conversion he is exhorted by God in the Scriptures, and also by his church. Further, infidels may perform actions that are not sins, since that negative infidelity, which arises from never having heard of the revelation of God, is excused from guilt because of invincible ignorance, and men may, in a supposed moral and natural

\* John xv: 4. † 2 Cor. iii: 5. ‡ Philip. i: 6. § Eph. ii: 8.  
|| Philip. i: 29.

order, if such order ever exists, use their free will to do certain good actions, such as to resist some less violent temptations, by their *natural forces*. This we can conclude from the fact that the church has condemned the following propositions: "Free will, without the aid of grace, can only be able to sin."\* And this other: "The sinner, without the grace of the liberator, is not free except for evil."† But even assisted by the ordinary graces of God, the just man, cannot without a special privilege, such as the church holds was accorded to the Blessed Virgin, mother of God, avoid all sins, even venial sins, during his whole life, though he may be able, with ordinary graces, to avoid all mortal sins, since he is able, with graces that will not be wanting to him, to observe all the commandments of God. Yet final perseverance, or death in a state of grace, is a special *gift* of God, and no man can be assured of this without he has received a special revelation from God, giving him this certitude. "He that perseveres to the end, he shall be saved,"‡ says the Saviour, and no one *can be certain* that he will persevere; but the just, who strive to live well, may entertain the firm hope of this, since God, if we are not wanting to his graces, will not on his part fail "to perfect in us the work which he has commenced,"§ "operating in us both to will and to accomplish."||

It is a doctrine of faith, that "God wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth,"¶ and therefore God gives to all men the means necessary for salvation. He consequently accords to all the graces necessary and sufficient for the observance of his commandments. He gives his graces even to sinners, and does not abandon pagans and those out of his church, but gives them the necessary means of salvation. Yet it is certain, that he is the absolute master of his gifts, and to some gives his graces more abund-

\* Condemned by Pius V. Greg. xiii. Urban viii.

† Constit. Unigenitus of Clement XI. prop. xxxviii.

‡ Math. x: 22. § Philip. i: 6. || Philip. ii: 13. ¶ 2 Tim. ii: 4.

antly than to others. As the Apostle St. Paul tells us: "To every one is given grace according to the measure of the giving of Christ."\* It is through Jesus Christ, our only mediator, that grace comes to us from God. Jesus Christ died for all men, and wishes all to be saved, but the means of salvation are gifts of his goodness and love, and, according to his own wise counsels, he distributes them as he pleases. "Friend, is it not lawful for me to do what I will?"† In the history of the church, among its members at all times, is seen the greatest diversity of graces, as also the greatest difference in the manner in which the graces of God are received and used.

*Of the Effects of Grace—Justification—Good Works.*

The chief effects of grace are justification and the merit of good works. Justification is a supernatural gift of God, which causes a man to pass from a state of sin into a state of grace, and renders him agreeable to God. As regards adults, to obtain the grace of justification, they are required to have certain dispositions, namely: Faith, by which a person believes and holds as true all that has been revealed, and, in particular, that the sinner is justified by the grace and merits of Jesus Christ; fear of the divine justice; hope in the mercy of God; a more or less explicit commencement of love of God as the source of all justice; hatred and detestation of sin, with the desire to receive the sacrament of baptism, and its actual reception, if possible, to lead a new life, and observe the commandments of God.

Faith is the first necessary disposition, being, as the Council of Trent teaches, "the commencement of man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification." For "without faith it is impossible to please God, and to be admitted among the number of his children."‡

This faith does not consist in a firm belief that our

\* Eph. iv : 7.  
vi ch. vi.

† Math. xx. 16.

‡ Council of Trent, Sess.



sins are forgiven, nor in a simple confidence in the divine mercy, but it is a firm belief in the word of God, of all the truths which he has revealed to his church, and teaches by his church, and a belief in God's promises. Not that all these truths must be believed *explicitly*; though some of them must. For instance, an adult could not be saved, if he did not, in an explicit manner, believe in God, in his providence, in the existence of another life, in which each person will receive according to his works.

An explicit faith in the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation is also necessary, at least by a moral necessity and of precept, for all who cannot plead an invincible ignorance of these mysteries.

But faith alone is not sufficient to justify a man; as St. James tells us: "by works a man is justified: and not by faith only."\* "What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works? Shall faith be able to save him?" "Faith without works is dead."†

Justification is not a mere imputation of the justice of Christ, nor a mere remission of sins, but a sanctification and renewal of the interior man, through the voluntary reception of grace and of the gifts, whereby man, of unjust becomes just, and of an enemy a friend, that so he may be an heir according to hope of life everlasting."

"Of this justification the causes are these: the final cause indeed is the glory of God and of Jesus Christ, and life everlasting; while the efficient cause is a merciful God who *washes and sanctifies* gratuitously, *signing* and anointing with the *Holy Spirit of promise*, who is the pledge of our inheritance; but the meritorious cause is His most beloved only-begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, *for the exceeding charity wherewith he loved us*, merited justification by His most Holy Passion on the wood of the cross, and made satisfaction for us unto God the Father;

\* St. James ii: 24.

† Ibid. chap. ii: 14-17-26.

the instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which (faith) no man can be justified; lastly, the alone formal cause is the justice of God, not that whereby He himself is just, but that whereby He maketh us just, that, to wit: with which *we* being endowed by Him *are renewed in the spirit of our mind*, and we are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are, just, receiving justice within us, each one according to his own measure, *which the Holy Ghost distributes to every one as He wills*, and according to each one's proper disposition and co-operation."\*

It is of faith, therefore, that this justice is *inherent* in the justified, and that "man, through Jesus Christ, in whom he is ingrafted, receives, in the said justification, together with the remission of sins, all these (gifts) infused at once, faith, hope and charity."†

This is the doctrine of faith, in the justification of adults who have never received baptism. "For the justification of those who have, after baptism, fallen by sin, and who may again be justified by the merits of Christ through the sacrament of Penance actually received or truly desired, besides cessation from sins, and a detestation thereof, there must be also sacramental confession and sacerdotal absolution; and likewise satisfaction by fasts, alms, prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life; not for the eternal punishment, which is forgiven in the sacrament, or by the desire of the sacrament, but for the temporal punishment, which is not always remitted in this sacrament as it is in baptism,"‡ since the ingratitude of the relapsing sinner is greater than before his renewal by baptism. Justification, as taught by the church consists therefore, in sanctifying grace which purifies us, and makes us agreeable to God; in the justice of God, who himself justifies us by the merits of Jesus Christ; in charity, which effaces sins, and establishes us in the friendship of God; in the communication of *the Holy Ghost*, who remains

\* Council of Trent, Sess. VI, ch. vii.

† Ibid.

‡ Council of

Trent, Sess. VI, ch. xiv.

in us and makes us dwell in him in union with the Father and the Son; in the sanctity, which, in regenerating us and renewing us interiorly, makes us heirs of the kingdom of God. "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, who, according to God, is created in justice and holiness of truth."\*

Although justification does not merely *cover sins* with the justice of Christ and sanctifying grace, so that they are *not imputed*, but it really removes, blots out our sins, and takes them away, while grace and charity are diffused in the heart by the Holy Ghost, yet a man, by sinning again, may lose his justification, because grace is lost by mortal sin. So also a man may increase in holiness, and become still more *justified*. The gifts of faith, hope, and charity, may be augmented in us, as the church teaches us to solicit from God in our prayers.

Christians, cannot, without revelation from God, be certain that they are in a state of grace, for "man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love or hatred;"† but they can confide in God's mercy, in the merits of Jesus Christ, and in the efficacy of his sacraments, and "with fear and trembling work out their salvation,"‡

### Of Good Works.

The second principal effect of grace is *the merit of good works*. By a meritorious action, we mean one worthy of recompense. Theologians distinguish two kinds of *merits*, the first, that of *condignity*, or *meritum de condigno*; and the second, that of suitability, or *congruity*, or *meritum de congruo*. As to the merit of condignity, because founded on a promise on the part of God, its reward is a matter of justice, God having become "*our debtor by his promise*," as St. Augustine expresses it. But as there is no promise to reward the second sort of merit, it is one that from the goodness and mercy of God expects a recompense,

\* Eph. iv: 23, 24.

† Ecclesiastes ix: 1.

‡ Philip. ii: 12.

which is meet and congruous, a reward entirely gratuitous.

The following canons of the Council of Trent show what is of Catholic faith on this point :

“If any one saith, that the good works of one that is justified, are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified; or that the said justified, by the good works which he performs through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life,—if so be, however, that he depart in grace,—and also an increase of glory; let him be anathema.” *Sess. vi., Can. xxxvii.*

“If any one saith, that the just ought not for their good works done in God, to expect and hope for eternal recompense from God, through His mercy and the merit of Jesus Christ—if so be, that they persevere to the end in well doing, and in keeping the divine commandments; let him be anathema.” *Sess. vi., Can. xxvi.*

There is nothing herein expressly defined about merit *de condigno* and *de congruo*, but as Bellarmine says: “The common opinion of theologians admits simply merit *de condigno*.” He says, they introduce three questions on the subject: 1st. Is the merit of the just to be said *de condigno* or *de congruo*? 2d. Is it *de condigno* by reason only of God’s promise, or also by reason of the works? 3d. Does God reward the just *above* the condign, and punish the wicked less than the condign? As to the first, all have to admit as of faith that the works of the just are meritorious of eternal life from the grace of God, but differ whether this be *de condigno* or *de congruo*. As to the second, some think that because of the works, even in absence of God’s promise, there would exist merit *de condigno*; others deny this, and, admitting that the works of the just are truly and properly good, say they can only have proportion with the end, and merit justly or condignly, from God’s liberal promise and agreement.

More of them, with Bellarmine, think the opinion *more probable* which teaches that the works of the just are meritorious of eternal life condignly, both by reason of the promise, and by reason of the dignity of the works. As to the last question, it is the common opinion of theologians that God from his liberality, rewards the just *above the condign*, though some with Vega deny this. But they do not seem to be certain whether God punishes the wicked *less* than they deserve, which, however, was the opinion of St. Augustine, and also of Bellarmine, as to the punishment awarded at the judgment being milder than the evil deserts of the wicked. That God awards to the just beyond what is merited seems apparent from the texts: "Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is *very great* in Heaven."\* "Give, and it shall be given to you: good measure and pressed down and shaken together and running over shall they give into your bosom." † "And Luke xix. 17, where ten cities having been given to him who gained ten talents, and afterwards from the person who had not improved his pound, it was taken, and, as an extraordinary gift, bestowed upon him who had the reward of ten cities." ‡

In order that a person may merit, certain conditions are requisite. 1st. Man can only merit while still in the present life—He must "work while the day lasts." 2dly. The actions must be under all respects good, with a supernatural goodness; the object of merit being supernatural, viz: grace and eternal life, the actions must be in proportion with it, and be supernaturally good. 3dly. The actions must be voluntary and free, having a liberty of choice, excluding all necessity absolute or relative. 4thly. To merit *condignly*, a man must be in the state of grace, or in union with Jesus Christ by charity; and lastly, to merit *condignly*, there must be a promise of God to give something, as *recompense* for our works. It is in virtue of His own engagements that He becomes our debtor. Without these

---

\* Math. v: 12. † Luko vi: 38. ‡ Luke xix: 17-24.



conditions, we may hope for and obtain certain graces from the goodness of God, and ought even to expect the graces necessary for our salvation, but God does not owe them to us, and it is only by a sort of *congruity*, that we look for them from his infinite mercy and goodness.

The question may be asked: *What things can we merit by our good works?* We answer, it is of faith that man can, in no manner, merit the *first* grace, which is purely and absolutely gratuitous.

2dly. It is of faith, as may be seen in the canons which we have cited, that the just can truly merit an increase of grace, eternal life, and an increase of the glory of Heaven. 3dly. The just cannot *condignly* merit *efficacious* grace, or final perseverance, as God has not promised either, if we take the word promise in its strict signification. But the just, by corresponding with grace, can, by *congruity* or *suitableness*, merit more abundant graces, and even *suppliantly* the gift of perseverance; "*Hoc itaque donum suppliciter emereri potest,*" says St. Augustine. 4thly. The sinner cannot *condignly*, or as a matter of justice, merit *sanctifying* grace, because, in order to merit *condignly*, he must be in union with Christ by charity, and in a state of grace. Yet, as God "does not will the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live,"\* if the sinner does what depends on him, he can obtain this favor from the mercy of God.

In considering good works and their merit, we must bear in mind, that it is not of the mere moral value of actions that we speak, but of their supernatural moral value, or their value in the order of salvation. The Apostle St. Paul says to all persons: "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling."† The Saviour says: "Lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven."‡ The sovereign Judge says: "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me to render to every man ac-

---

\* Ezech. ch. xxxiii : 11. † Philip ii : 12. ‡ Math. vi : 20.

ording to his works."\* And St. Paul teaches that "every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor."† For although, without grace, men can do nothing to obtain eternal life, yet grace will not do every thing for them, but they must co-operate with it, and, "by their good works," give glory to God who assists them.‡

The justification of an adult is comparatively only commenced by his translation from a state of sin, when God, in whom he believes, makes him a godly and just man by washing away his sins in baptism; for "he who is just, let him be justified still, and he who is holy let him be sanctified still."§ For this, St. Augustine represents, when he says: "After that, *by fighting with the vices*, from the guilt of which we have been discharged," we must make progress in justice. Nor will this even be enough without our justice shall be perfected, "for not the hearers of the laws are just before God; but the doers of the law shall be justified."|| They who do the law "*shall be justified*" by the judgment of God, and their justice shall be perfected if they persevere in doing justice, for as St. Augustine also holds: "Our hope shall be fully accomplished in the resurrection of the dead; and when our hope shall be fulfilled, then shall our justification be fulfilled and accomplished."¶

Now, for progress in justification, which is increase in grace and sanctity, and for the perfection of justification, which is its accomplishment by the just judgment of God, good works are indispensable. St. Cyprian says: "It is a small matter to be able to get something. It is more to be able to keep what is once gotten: as in faith itself and the salutary birth, it is not the receiving, but the keeping of it that giveth life, neither is it the attaining, but the perfecting, that preserveth a man to God. This our Lord taught by his

---

\* Apoc. xxii: 12. † 1 Cor. iii: 8. ‡ Math. vi: 16. § Apoc. xxii: 11. || Rom. ii: 13. ¶ St. Aug. Ep. 106, and Sermo. 61, de verb. Dom.

own instruction,\* when He said: "Lo thou art made whole, sin now no more, lest some worse thing befall thee."† When Christ "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity," the Apostle represents that it was his purpose "to cleanse to himself a people acceptable, a pursuer of good works."‡ Wherefore the Apostle exhorts: "That you receive not the grace of God in vain,"§ which would be the case most certainly, if being "washed" in baptism, and justified, a man did not pursue good works, but still did the works of the flesh, since St. Peter declares: "For it had been better for them not to have known the way of justice, than after they have known it, to turn back from that holy commandment that was delivered to them."|| The unclean spirit may be cast out, and the house swept, but if he is allowed to enter again, he goes in "with seven others worse than himself, and the last state of that man is worse than the first."¶ The order given by our Lord to the Apostles was to teach the people his gospel, and "to command them to observe" all his commandments; for the people whom he desired, and who, as foretold in the prophecy of Zachary, when he "was filled with the Holy Ghost," should be granted to him, were a people, "who should serve him without fear, in holiness and justice before him, all (their) days."\*\*

The advice given in Ecclesiasticus is: "Let nothing hinder thee from praying always, and be not afraid to be *justified even to death*; for the reward of God continueth forever."†† The good or bad works which we do are the seed we sow, "and what things a man soweth the same shall he reap, for he that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall reap corruption. But he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall reap *life everlasting*. And in doing good let us not fail."‡‡ "Wherefore, brethren, labour the more that by good works you may make sure your calling and election."§§ It is evident, therefore, that a man's

\* John v. † Cyp. Lib. i. Ep. 5. ‡ Tit. ii: 14. § 2 Cor. vi; 1.  
 ¶ 2 Peter ii: 24. ¶ Math. xii: 45. \*\* Luke i: 67-75. †† Eccl.  
 xviii: 22. ‡‡ Gal. vi: 8, 9. §§ 2 Pet. i: 10.

vocation and election can derive great benefit from good works, since St. Peter recommends them as the means to make *election sure*, or certain, and consequently they must have an intrinsic value, and are not the mere evidences of faith. St. Paul represents "everlasting, or eternal life," as the product of a man's works or of what he sows, for he says, "he shall reap everlasting life," and it must therefore be, by the merits of his good works, that he obtains it, although not by his works alone, since "eternal life is the grace of God," but by his works inspired and aided by divine grace.

There never was a greater snare of the devil to ruin souls than the notion, that man will be saved by *faith alone* as taught by Luther; and that good works are no more than a testimony to declare their faith, but are not deserving of any reward of life everlasting, as taught by Calvin.\*

This was not the invention of these reformers, for St. Augustine combated the same error, saying: "That is the most dangerous opinion of all, whereby men are made believe, that no matter how lewdly and shamelessly they live, and even continue in that kind of life, yet if they only believe in Christ, and receive his sacraments, they shall come to everlasting life."† St. Augustine even shows the source of this error; he says: "For men, not understanding these words of the Apostle: *We think a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law*, Rom. iii: 28, thought, he said, it is sufficient for a man to have faith although he live wickedly and do no good works. But God forbid that the chosen vessel should be of that opinion."‡ The Apostle did not mean to exclude "the works of faith," but merely "the works of the law," for he declares expressly: "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith that worketh by charity."§ "It is not every faith," says St. Augustine, "whereby a

\* Calv. Insti. Cap. de Just. Cap. 10. † Aug. de Fide et Ope. Cap. 27. ‡ Aug. de Gratiâ et Liber. Arb. c. 7. § Gal. vi: 6.

man believeth in God, that the Apostle determineth to be healthful and evangelical, but it is that faith, saith he, *which worketh through charity*, whereupon he avoucheth that the faith, which some assume to be sufficient for their salvation, availeth nothing; in so much that he declares: ‘if I have *all faith*, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, it *profiteth me nothing*.’”\* If it be the faith that worketh by charity that availeth, it is conclusive that faith alone availeth nothing for salvation. And how then can faith alone justify a man? Justification is a great thing, and the faith that is alone without charity profiteth *nothing*, much less can it avail to justify. Faith may be in the wicked but not charity, and therefore not an active working faith, for wherever there is charity it worketh, and charity cannot be where faith is not, but where charity is, with it faith itself also worketh. Though there is also a law for charity, yet it is not merely “a work of the law,” for it is a gift of the Holy Ghost, and the grace of God; “the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us.”†

No person can love God unless he believes in him; but no person also can love God and not keep his commandments, for the Saviour says: “if any man love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and will make our abode with him.”‡ Again: “God is charity; and he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him.”§ “Now who is it that loveth God?” Jesus Christ answers this question: “He that hath my commandments and keepeth them: He it is that loveth me.”|| What is it to believe in Christ? It is to dwell in Christ, and not merely to give assent of the mind that the Son of God came on earth and died for sinners, since *the devils believe and tremble*, and yet they cannot profit by their belief. “Whoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God,

\* St. Aug. de Fide et Op. e. ch. 14. De Gratia et lib. arbit. ch. 7.  
 Enchirid. c. 8. † Rom. v. 5. ‡ John xiv. 23. § 1 John v. 16.  
 || John xiv. 21.



God abideth in him, and he in God." But, as we have seen, faith alone will not cause God to abide in any man, but "he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him," and therefore the confession of Christ must be in charity as well as faith, and this charity must not be merely in words but in works, a charity that worketh; it must be a love of God which keeps his commandments, a charity which obeys: "And whereas indeed he was the Son of God, he learned *obedience* by the things which he suffered; and being consummated, he became *to all that obey him*, the cause of eternal salvation."\*

Did he become the cause of salvation to those who only believe in him, and who do not obey him? Certainly not. Yet the Apostle says, "by grace you are saved through faith," † but he does not say by faith alone; nor by a faith that excludes charity and obedience; nor even by a faith which excludes hope, for he says: "For we are saved by hope." ‡ He also says: "He saved us by the laver of regeneration, and the renovation of the Holy Ghost," § which is, by baptism. It is through hope and love that our faith must work, and by these three together man is conducted to God, through obedience, and with the use of the sacraments, which Jesus Christ has provided to be the channels for applying the merits of his blood, and conferring the graces which are necessary. For "being justified by his blood, we shall be saved," || for "in him we have redemption by his blood, the remission of sins," ¶ and therefore St. Augustine draws up a general conclusion as to the difference between the sacraments of the old law and those of the new; the first "promise a saviour," but "the sacraments of the new law *give salvation*." \*\* And why are these last so superior in excellence and efficacy? He says: "The side of Christ hanging on the cross was struck with a lance, and the sacraments of the church flowed out." † † The sacraments, there-

\* Heb. v: 8, 9. † Eph. ii: 8. ‡ Rom. viii: 24. § Tit. 3: 5.

|| Rom. v: 9. ¶ Eph. i: 7, and Col. i: 14. \*\* St. Aug. in Ps. 73.

† † St. Aug. in Ps. 56 and Ps. 103.

fore, coming from the side of Christ, apply to us his blood. They are instruments for cleansing us with the blood of redemption, and enriching us with sanctifying graces. "Their value is unspeakable," as we are told by the same St. Augustine, "and therefore the contempt of them renders persons sacrilegious; for that is impiously despised without which godliness and piety cannot be perfected."\* What has been already said should be sufficient to prove that it is vain to confide in a justification by faith alone, and to establish the value, importance, and necessity of other virtues, and of good works. We will therefore conclude this part of the subject with a statement of reasons why such works of the just man are so agreeable to God. The 1st is, because God has been pleased to ordain that man and his actions performed by aid of his own graces should tend to the supernatural end to which he encourages him to aspire. 2dly, because of the merits of his own beloved Son and the grace of redemption, God blessing us in Jesus Christ with spiritual blessings. 3dly. Because of his *adoption* of us by baptism among his children, our works receive a great and threefold dignity in his sight; 1st, as the works of his children; 2dly, as effected by the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in us and is the author of them; 3dly, because by grace we are made members of the mystic body of Jesus Christ, so that our good works are referred to him as to the head of the body, and are therefore especially worthy of esteem. 4thly. Moreover they are of value, because they are not good works except as having been induced by the *prevenient* and performed by the *assisting* grace of God. And finally, a chief reason why God should value and reward them is, because of his most *liberal promise* to reward the good works of his children according to the merit of their goodness.

It is a mere subterfuge to object to such good works as unworthy of merit, because of God's infinite perfec-

---

\* St. Aug. Cont. Faust. lib. 19, Cap. 11.

tion and holiness, and man's imperfections and unworthiness, because God does not propose in rigor to refer the works of men to the standard of his own most excellent and perfect justice, but to the standard of such justice and perfection as he invites man to aspire to, and as he knows man can attain to, when assisted by the graces, which he liberally bestows upon him in order to make him able to become holy, and bring forth in his life the fruits of holiness.

For gaining the reward, it is certain that *final perseverance* is necessary, and since no person, without an express revelation, can be certain that he will persevere to the end, or even be assured that his works have all the conditions requisite to make them worthy of recompense, it is not probable that any one seeking salvation will be foolish enough to confide in his own past merits, but rather shelter himself, with frequent prayers and appeals for forgiveness of his daily faults and imperfections, under the infinite mercies and goodness of God.

Modern rationalists, in their empty pride, may pretend that this doctrine of grace depreciates the dignity and the natural forces of man, and constrains his freedom of will. They think nature suffices, and will have nothing but nature. But the Christian knows that man is a contingent, dependent being, and that he would soon cease to exist, the moment God should withdraw from him that active aid, which preserves his existence, and, in giving which, God concurs with his actions while he leaves them *perfectly free*; so he is convinced, that the same all-wise and intelligent Being, free in his operations, knows how to give aid to man, and to concur with his actions in the supernatural order, without throwing constraint on his freedom of will. The Christian has not only experience of the insufficiency of man's natural forces with respect to willing and doing good, of his deficiency of reason and infirmity of will, and of his inclination to evil, but moreover, he has actual experience of an assisting agency, something which he knows is not of himself, inspiring

and exciting him to resist evil in thought, word, and deed, suggesting better, nobler thoughts and purposes, and strengthening his will to deny himself, and to practice virtue in defiance of the strongest temptations.

He has experience of the influence of grace, and knows that he can resist it, while he freely obeys it. He therefore esteems it a wonderful enhancement of his dignity, that his God, as a loving Father, while leaving him in the hands of his own counsel, should invite him to aspire to an end so greatly above his deserts and his natural powers, a supernatural end, the glory and happiness of heaven; and should supply his want of ability by his divine assistance freely offered, and to be freely accepted.\*

### *Of Predestination.*

As the great mystery of Predestination is usually considered by theologians when treating the subject of grace, a few words concerning it may perhaps be desired. The Council of Trent tells us: "No one moreover, so long as he is in this mortal life, ought so far to presume as regards the secret mystery of divine predestination, as to determine for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate; as if it were true, that he that is justified, either cannot sin any more, or if he do sin, that he ought to promise himself

---

\* Some, like the Pelagians, have erred by exalting man's natural forces, as if sufficient of themselves to conduct man to his supernatural end, and others, like Baius, by attributing all to grace, asserting an entire ruin of human liberty, and ignoring or denying free will in man, so easy is it for the human mind to fall into errors about revealed truths. If man had not free will, it could not be understood how he could be responsible; how he could commit sin; or why God would give commandments and make promises of reward for keeping them, and with threats of punishment for their violation; how God could sit in judgment upon men; or what would be in man to be saved; for according to St Bernard's remark: "Take away free will, and there will be nothing that may be saved."—*De Grat. et Lib. Arbit.* Man's free will was weakened by original sin, but not destroyed, and is repaired by the grace of God in the sacrament of baptism.



an assured repentance; for except by special revelation, it cannot be known whom God has chosen to Himself."\*

With reference to God Himself, who exists in eternity, and by whom all, that is possible or existing, is seen at once and always, the word predestination would seem to be a term inapplicable. It is a word suited to our mode of existence in succession of time, and for us, there no doubt exists, that which corresponds with it, an eternal calling, foreknowing, election, and foreordaining of those most happy persons who will be saved, received into glory, and enjoy God and everlasting life. It would be impossible that God should not know these as well from eternity as when their glory shall be fulfilled. Their number is of course fixed and certain: It is revealed to us that God desires all to be saved, and that Jesus Christ died for all, and consequently, that the grace necessary for salvation is given to all, yet it is given in different measures and proportions. God has, it seems, more solicitude for the safety of some, who like St. Paul, are vessels of election, than for others, but the mystery of his Providence is an abyss into which we have no power to gaze. St. Augustine says, "Predestination is nothing else than that *foreknowledge*, and *preparation* of the benefits of God, by which, most certainly those are liberated, whoever are liberated."† Another definition is that termed by St. Thomas magisterial: "Predestination is the preparation of grace in the present, and of glory in the future."‡

The opposite, to predestination to efficacious and victorious grace and to glory, is called *reprobation*, which, as God does nothing in time which he has not resolved to do from eternity, is called an eternal decree, excluding from everlasting life, and consigning to eternal pains, certain persons on account of their sins. Some make a distinction without a very great difference, and

---

\* Sess. VI., ch. xii. † Aug. De dono. Perseverantiæ. ‡ l. Diss. 60, quaest. i, Art. ii.



call it "a passing by," or withholding of predestination; though this amounts to an exclusion.

That there exists a true predestination is clear from the citation we have made from the Council of Trent, and also from the sacred Scriptures. Our Saviour says: "Come ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Math. xxv: 34. "Fear not, little flock, for it hath pleased your Father to give you a kingdom." Luke xii: 32. "And whom he predestinated them also he called. And whom he called; them he also justified. And whom he justified; them he also glorified." Rom. viii: 30. Again: "As he chose us in him *before the foundation of the world*, that we should be holy and unspotted in his sight in charity. Who had predestined us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the purpose of his will." Ephes. i: 4, 5.

As it is expressly declared in the Scriptures that life everlasting is the *grace of God*: "But the grace of God, life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord," Rom. vi: 22, we are required to believe, as being of faith, that this predestination is a gratuitous gift of God, the grace of graces. Yet as the Scriptures also term it a *reward*, and a *crown* of justice, eternal life, as glory, also supposes the merits of the just. But it is also a doctrine of faith that the good works and merits of the just are themselves gifts of God. It is by the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ, that the just are able to merit eternal life by their good works, so that the merits of the just are not excluded by the fact that predestination is a grace.

Theologians speculate about the decree of predestination. Some think it absolute, and that God gives it without respect to prevision of the merits of the just by the aid of his grace, and that they do not attain glory because they correspond with grace, but correspond with grace because predestined to glory, while others think the decree is conditional, and founded on God's prevision of the merits of the just from grace

given to them. The church has never decided this question, and it is one that men cannot settle by appeal to the Scriptures. It being left free, many great and pious divines incline to believe that the predestination is conditional, and founded on a prevision of supernatural merits in the just. They think this presents fewer difficulties, and harmonizes more with the will of God that all should be saved; but as it has never been decided by the church, they refrain from censuring the opinion that the decree is absolute, and anterior to the prevision of supernatural merits, and this opinion is sustained by theologians of great authority, with strong reasons. Of course the advocates of both opinions make them agree with the doctrine of free will in man, which is a point of faith that all have to receive.

Lessius, the learned Jesuit, in his treatise on predestination, had advocated the opinion, that predestination to glory is consequent on God's prevision of merits, and St. Francis of Sales, in writing to him, shows that the same was his opinion. "In the library of the college of Lyons," he writes to him, "I saw your treatise on predestination. It is true I have only glanced over it hurriedly, as is sometimes done. Yet I have not failed to remark that your paternity entertains that opinion, so ancient, so consoling, and so authorized by the Scriptures in their natural meaning, namely, *that God predestines men to glory in consequence of his prevision of their merits*; and this for me has been the cause of the greatest joy, as I have always regarded this doctrine as the most consonant with the mercy of God, and with his grace, as the most approaching the truth, and most calculated to inspire love of God, as I have, in the meantime, indicated in my little book on *the Love of God*."\*

The doctrine of the ancient *predestinationists* was, that God, by an eternal decree, absolutely, and without regard to the lives of persons, foreordained and

---

\* Letter from Annecy, Aug. 26, 1618, in Vol. III. of works of St. Francis de Sales.

predestined certain persons to wickedness, and to eternal torments. Calvin revived this revolting error. The Church has declared such a belief detestable, and set upon it the seal of her *anathema*.

The second council of Orange, held in the year 529, says: "Not only do we not believe that God has predestined some to evil, but if there be any who wish to believe so wicked a thing, with the greatest detestation we say to them: *Anathema*."\* The council of Valence, held in 855, says: "That God foreknew, and eternally has foreknown that the good were to do good things, and that the wicked were to do evil things. . . . . We hold, and it pleaseth us to hold, that He foreknew that the good were to be good entirely through his grace, and through the same grace to receive eternal rewards; that He foreknew that the wicked were to be bad through their own malice, and to be condemned to eternal punishment by his justice."† The same council further declares that the prevision of God imposes no necessity on any one; but that God, who knows all things before they occur, has foreseen that the wicked would be so by their own will; that whoever is condemned is so by the desert of his own iniquity, and not by a decree anterior to the divine foreknowledge; if any perish, it is not because they were not able to be good, but because they were not willing to be good. The Council of Trent has the following canon: "If any one saith, that the grace of justification is only attained by those who are predestined unto life; but that all others who are called, are called indeed, but receive not grace, as being by divine power predestined unto evil; let him be *Anathema*."‡ The following sentence from St. Augustine, on the same point, is very clear: "God is good, God is just; He can liberate certain persons without good merits, because he is good; He cannot damn any one without evil merits, because he is just;"§ When Jesus Christ condemns the

\* Council of Orange, Can. xxii. † In Labbe, Counc. Tom. viii. Col. 135, cited by Goussier. ‡ Sess. VI Can. xvii. § Lib. iii Cont. Julian, Cap. xviii

wicked at the final judgment, he enumerates their demerits as the cause; and he says that "everlasting fire was prepared for the Devil and his angels," but he does not say it was prepared for wicked men,\* so also St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, chap. ii: 9, says: "Tribulation and anguish upon every soul that worketh evil." "Is it my will that a sinner should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should be converted from his ways and live?"† "The Lord delayeth not his promise, as some imagine, but dealeth patiently for your sake, not willing that any should perish, but that all should return to penance."‡ "For God made not death, neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living."§ It is therefore a dogma of faith, that God does not decree any one to reprobation and eternal punishment except after his prevision of their voluntary wickedness. If then, there be some whom God has not included in his decree of predestination to glory and eternal life, it is certain, that His prevision of their unwillingness to obey and serve him, and keep his commandments, went before his reprobation of them. As to infants, who die without baptism, even when their parents are guilty of no neglect in trying to procure baptism for them, it must be admitted, that, by his general providence, God has afforded them the means of salvation, which would have become a special blessing to them, had all his laws and intentions been corresponded with freely by men; but because of excesses and violations of his laws, which take place somewhere in the line of descent, and even at times are committed by the immediate ancestors, there are children with bodies so unfitted to endure, that they merely come into the world, breathe a few times, and fall immediately into the arms of death, before baptism can be administered to them. For such, it cannot be pretended that God is bound to suspend his laws and work miracles to sustain their lives, that they may receive baptism. Besides, who can

\* Math. xxv.

† Ezech. xviii: 23.

‡ 2 Peter iii: 9.

§ Wisd. i: 13.



say if God does not foreknow that these very infants, if left longer in life, would afterwards be in a worse condition during all eternity, than they will be from having died without baptism? Who knows, if left in life, that they would not, as so many do, abuse reason, grace and all the gifts of God, and daily "heap up for themselves treasures of wrath" for eternity? It may then be a special mercy to them, for all we know, that they are taken away unbaptized, and without any actual sins to be expiated. Also many infants die unbaptized from the criminal unbelief and indifference of parents, although their lives are prolonged sufficiently, but no one can say that God should work miracles to make those parents carry their children to the font of baptism.

There can be conceived no more flagrant absurdity than for a person to argue, as some are said to do, that because the mystery of predestination exists, and God foreknows whether they will be among the elect or reprobate, and whatever he foreknows will necessarily occur, they will continue to live as pleases them.

It is absurd to argue and act thus about their most important affair, when they do not reason and act in the same way about other matters. All things that are to occur to us in the future, are as much foreknown to God as is our lot during eternity, and yet no man says: God knows whether I will have money or not, and therefore I will not work or act for obtaining it; God knows whether or not I will have a crop, and therefore I will not trouble myself about preparing the ground, putting in the grain, or attending to it; I am very sick, and God knows whether I am to get well, and I will not use remedies nor employ the skill of a physician. Why then should a man so reason about his lot in eternity? Rather he ought to say: if God foresees that I am to be among the saved, he also foresees that I am to keep his commandments, and pursue a holy life and good works, and if I am now living in this manner I must "take heed lest I fall," but I may hope for his grace to grow yet more holy, and to persevere to the end. But if I am leading a wicked life, and am



unwilling to change my conduct, God no doubt has foreseen the whole of this, and no doubt he foresees how it will terminate with me, as I may also be able to foresee myself, from what has happened to others, and from what reason and God's revelation teach me; and if I wish to avoid such an awful destiny, I had better pray to God to aid me with his grace, and change my life immediately, since I cannot expect to die in the friendship and love of God, unless I strive to live as his servant and friend. I know that "God wills not the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live."\*

*The Five Propositions of Jansenius.*

We here present the noted five propositions of Jansenius, as declared to be taught in his book under the title of *Augustinus*, in which Jansenius pretended to give the doctrine of St. Augustine on grace. Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, was born the 28th of October, 1585, and died on the 6th of May, 1638. His book, published after his death, caused great trouble and dispute. The bishops of France denounced it to the Holy See, and asked for the condemnation of the five propositions, which show the errors he taught in his book. They were condemned by Pope Innocent X. on the 31st of May, 1653. They are as follows:

I.—Some of the commandments of God are impossible to the just, even when they desire and exert themselves to accomplish them, according to the forces they have at the time; and the grace which would render them possible is wanting to them.

*Condemned as heretical.*

II.—In the state of fallen nature interior grace is never resisted.

*Condemned as heretical.*

---

\* Ezech. xxxiii: 11.

III.—In order to merit or demerit in the state of fallen nature, the liberty in man, which excludes necessity, is not required, but the liberty, which excludes constraint, suffices.

*Condemned as heretical.*

IV.—The Semipelagians admitted the necessity of interior prevenient grace for each action in particular, even for the commencement of faith; and they were heretics in this that they wished that this grace be such, that the will of man can resist or obey it.

*Condemned as false and heretical.*

V.—To say that Jesus Christ died, or shed his blood generally for all men, is to fall into the error of the Semipelagians.

*This proposition was condemned as false; and, understood in the sense that Jesus Christ only died for the salvation of the predestinated, it was condemned as impious, blasphemous, and heretical.*

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

OF EXTERNAL WORSHIP—RELIGION MUST BE EXTERNAL AND CORPORAL, AS WELL AS INTERNAL AND SPIRITUAL—SIGNS—CEREMONIES AND FORMS.

Jesus Christ declared that in his religion men “should worship God in spirit and in truth.” His religion then, being the relations between God and man, must be in accordance with the natures of both man and God. God is a pure spirit, but man is not. He is a compound or mixed being, consisting of body as well as of soul. The soul is the most excellent part of his being, but the body is an integral portion, and the soul does not act alone, but acts by the body, and with the body. The union of these two substances is profound and intimate, and,

while life remains, they depend on each other. The soul needs and uses the senses in all the acts of man, and hence in all our relations we need the sensible, material element, such as words spoken and written, signs, ceremonies, forms, images, &c. The course of our life is made up of the constant use of the sensible and material, although the mind infuses into these the ideal and intelligible. "God is a spirit; and they that adore him, must adore him in spirit and in truth." \* To worship God in spirit, is not enough therefore, because the *truth* of man's nature is not found in spirit only, but requires also the body, and, therefore, to worship God in *truth*, and with the whole man, our worship must also be the worship of all the powers of the body, together with all the faculties of the soul. A religion purely spiritual, is a conceit imagined by the pride of those, who do not love to carry the yoke of God's service, since they are not able to do any thing purely spiritual, in order to manifest to their fellow men that they acknowledge their dependance on God, for their existence, and for all that they are and have. And even when they profess to have any religion at all, they are forced to use the sensible, material element to declare this, as their words are but signs, and are not things purely spiritual. Hence their pretence, to love a purely spiritual religion, is a mere disguise for the absence of religion.

Moreover, God, who is spiritual, chose to make himself known to man, not as he is, a spirit, *sicuti est*, but in a manner suited to man's nature, and hence, "he fitted to himself a body," and made himself perceptible to the senses of man, visible, and able to be handled by man, and to be heard by him, when he should teach him the truths and practices of his religion. The *In-carnation*, or God made man, is the great fundamental fact of Christianity. All, then, in the religion of Jesus Christ, must be in conformity and harmony with this fact. Hence, the organization of a visible teaching

---

\* John iv : 24.

church, informing the whole society of persons who are taught, and who, believing, live according to their faith. Hence, in this society, the institution of a great, and pure external oblation or sacrifice for the worship of God. Hence, also, the institution of certain principal signs, termed sacraments, visible, sensible elements, but differing from all mere signs, by the fact, that the power of God has made them the channels of His divine graces, and enabled them to convey what they signify. Hence, finally, all the externals, the forms, and ceremonies of religion, to serve as monitors of the ideal and spiritual, to be the means to inspire religious sentiments and emotions, and to give expression to these not only in the sight of God, but even of men also, and thus to constitute the bond of fellowship in the great religious society of God's church. In external worship, besides the oblation of the great sacrifice, with its essential ceremonies, Jesus Christ has himself instituted certain signs for the application of the graces, which he has purchased for men, and which are called sacraments. These consist of outward sensible signs or ceremonies, containing and conferring invisible graces. Such could only be instituted by the power of God. Besides these, however, under the direction of Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit, the Apostles and the church have appointed numerous other ceremonies and signs, to signify and express the spiritual things of religion, and thus to keep, under different circumstances, before the minds of men, by appeals to their senses, the ideas, thoughts, sentiments, and emotions, which pertain to God, their Saviour, and lift up their minds and hearts above the mere material things of time and the world. Some of these signs or ceremonies pertain to the more solemn oblation of the sacrifice, and administration of the sacraments, and others, to minor offices and functions of private and public worship.

Ceremonies, considered apart from those of greater dignity which contain and confer grace, may be regarded in the light of a language, empty forms, to those who know not their meaning, but full of utility to those



acquainted with their signification. If the church has many ceremonies, it is, because, enriched with spiritual gifts and ideas, she has much to express to God and to her children. She needs a copious language in her worship, because God has placed in her the fountains of salvation, and she must converse about these with the whole world of man, with all the nations of the earth, and endeavour by all the avenues to man's mind and heart; by all the powers of his soul, and by all his senses, to attract him to the waters of life, that he may obtain refreshment, and experience that "a day in the house of the Lord, is better than a thousand years in the tabernacles of sinners." The church, therefore, like the Royal Prophet, calling upon all the creatures of God to bless him, makes every creature, that she is able, tributary to the great office which she is commissioned to fulfil, and uses every thing in her service of God, and, therefore, she devotes the whole man and all things to the worship of God. She never loses sight of the spiritual, nor does she forget the fact that the soul of man acts through the body, and is acted on through the senses. If she failed to do this, men acted upon constantly by this world, by its spirit and its maxims, through its forms, ceremonies, signs, and images, would seldom or never think of God, of their duty to him, and of the eternal interests of their souls. Those who declaim against ceremonies and forms, really desire to destroy those things which dwell in these forms, knowing that the truths signified will soon perish from the minds of men, when the forms that signify them, and are monitors thereof to men, are swept away. As well expect men to be thinking beings without the words of a language, and the images in the mind of external objects, as to hope that they will have and preserve a religion, that is destitute of external worship, and without signs, ceremonies and forms.



## CHAPTER XIV.

## OF THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

Grace, which is necessary for man's justification, is communicated to him through the sacraments. As grace is accorded to man in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the sacraments owe their influence to His passion and death on the cross. They are the authentic organs or channels by which Jesus Christ distributes and applies his merits and graces. The price was paid on the cross, but the application to individuals is made in the sacraments. The church teaches that all true justice in men, "either commences by means of the sacraments, or being commenced is increased by them, or being lost is through them recovered."\*

A sacrament is defined: A sensible and sacred sign, instituted by Jesus Christ, for the sanctification of the souls of men by his grace. To constitute a sacrament three things are necessary. 1st. There must be an outward sign, of which the senses may take note. 2d. This sign must be appointed by Jesus Christ, who only could give to it the power to bestow grace.

3dly. It must convey invisible grace, otherwise it might be a sign, but not a sacrament.

It is of faith, that Jesus Christ instituted sacraments in his church, and that these are precisely seven in number; viz: Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Order, and Matrimony. It is of Faith, that these seven symbols not only signify something spiritual, but actually *of themselves*, where there is no obstacle in the receiver, directly, immediately, and by their intrinsic efficacy, confer the graces which they signify. In them, Jesus Christ has placed a divine principle, and this enables them by its efficacy to produce grace in the soul. They

---

\* Council Trent, Sess. vii: Commencement.

do not act merely in a moral manner, like other signs and ceremonies, which awaken sentiments of faith, confidence, and the like, but they carry into the soul divine grace, as channels conduct the waters that flow through them, and thus grace is conferred upon the soul by the application of the external rites, or as theologians express it, *in virtue of what is done, ex opere operato*; and these rites or sacraments do not owe their efficacy in any manner, to the administrator of them. It is suitable that the administrator of the sacraments should be himself holy, but if he be not, the sacraments are not deprived of their efficacy which comes from the power of Jesus Christ. So also, the receiver should have suitable dispositions, but suitable dispositions only remove obstacles to the access of God's grace, and do not constitute an efficient cause of grace. They prepare the soul, and remove what might prevent or retard the effect of the sacraments, but do not constitute the efficacy of the sacraments, which is intrinsic in the rites chosen by Jesus Christ. The better the dispositions of the receiver, the more abundant the grace received. And while the one who administers, does not, by his spiritual condition, increase or diminish the efficacy of the sacraments, yet if he dispenses the holy things of God while in the state of sin, he is guilty of still another sin, unless he be excused by the gravity and urgency of the case, forcing him to administer some of the sacraments, when not in the state of grace.

The sacraments are of two kinds. The first class is termed the sacraments *of the dead*, or sacraments for such as are dead in sin, and these confer what is termed *the first grace*, or the life of grace. These are Baptism and Penance. The second class consists of the other five sacraments, which are termed the sacraments *of the living*, because those who receive them should be in the state of grace, and with them, receive an increase of grace. They, ordinarily, confer what is termed *second grace*, though in extraordinary

cases and accidentally, they may sometimes give the first grace.

The sacraments have been instituted for special ends. By Baptism, we "are born again." By Confirmation, we grow and are strengthened. By the Holy Eucharist, we are fed and nourished. By Penance, we are healed or cured of our sins. By Extreme Unction, we receive strength to undergo death properly. By Holy Order, pastors and ministers are secured to the church. By Matrimony, children are given to the church. These sacraments are the means of conferring on the soul a grace, appropriate to the end for which each was instituted, and which is termed *sacramental* grace.

It is of Faith, that three of these sacraments imprint in the soul an indelible mark or character, and can, therefore, be received only once. These three are Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Order. The first makes us children of God; the second soldiers of Jesus Christ; the third gives to those who receive it the character of minister of Jesus Christ. These characters, unlike grace, are received by all who *voluntarily* receive these sacraments, whether they are disposed properly or not. Of course, any person, who has attained the use of reason,\* who had no wish to receive any of these sacraments, or who willed not to receive it, would not receive such sacrament, nor its character, if conferred against his will, but only a null and invalid rite. But a person, who thought there was no efficacy in the sac-

---

\* Infants, having incurred the necessity of baptism without their consent, are also regenerated by baptism without their consent, since, according to the order established by Jesus Christ, the church supplies it. But for adults it is different. Innocent III. says: "He who never consents, but contradicts entirely, neither receives the character nor the thing (*rem*) of the sacrament." *Chap. Maj. de Bapt.* To the *validity* of the sacrament, the true faith is not necessary; as remarked by St. Augustine: "It may happen that a man has the whole sacrament and a perverse faith." *Lib. iii: De Bapt.* The church does not reiterate certain sacraments received in other denominations, as for instance, baptism or order, unless there be doubt about the value of the rite. If the defect of faith rendered it impossible to have the contrition necessary as a part of penance, the sacrament would be thereby null.

raments, and who came forward hypocritically, yet *voluntarily* presented himself, and acted publicly like other recipients, would receive the character, though not the grace of the sacrament.

Those persons who are by Holy Order prepared to be ministers of Jesus Christ, bishops and priests, are the ordinary and proper ministers of the sacraments. The bishops only are the ministers of the sacrament of Holy Order, and, except in very extraordinary cases, of Confirmation also. The bishops and the priests together are the ordinary ministers of the other sacraments, though, of matrimony, many theologians hold that the parties themselves, under required conditions, are the real ministers. But it is held by the church that any person, no matter of which sex, or what his religious belief, may, in all cases, *validly* confer the sacrament of baptism, and in cases of necessity, may also lawfully administer this sacrament, and it is even a duty to do so. A sportive, or jocular administration of these sacred rites, would only be a profanation. There must be in the minister at least the intention to do what the church does, or what the author of the sacraments intended.\* Even if the minister did not himself believe in the efficacy of the sacrament, he would confer that sacrament, supposing him otherwise qualified to administer it, if he had the intention seriously to do that which the church regards as a sacrament. The sacraments were instituted for all of mankind, yet all persons cannot receive all the sacraments. A woman is incapable of receiving Holy Order; a child before it has the use of reason, is incapable of receiving the sacrament of Penance; and a person in health of receiving Extreme Unction. An infidel might receive the Holy Eucharist, *materially*, but baptism is necessary to fit a person to receive the other sacraments, and, if unbaptized, a man would not receive any

---

\* If any one saith, that, in ministers, when they effect (*conficiunt*) and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the church does; let him be anathema. \* *Sess. vii. Can. xi. of the sacraments in general.*



thing from them if administered to him; for baptism is the door to the rest of the sacraments. It is of faith that all the sacraments are necessary for salvation, in the arrangement which God has been pleased to make for saving men, but all the sacraments are not necessary for each person. Two of them, baptism and penance, are absolutely necessary for salvation, as *the necessary means*; baptism for the unbaptized, and penance for those who have fallen into mortal sin after baptism. The sinner absolutely needs these sacraments and cannot be saved without them. Either he must receive them *actually*, or where this is *impossible*, he must have *perfect charity*, together with the express or implied desire to receive them, or be purified by martyrdom. The other sacraments are not absolutely, but only morally necessary—that is, they are necessary by precept, for the person who is to receive them is supposed to be already in the state of grace, and reconciled with God, and they are intended to impart to him an increase of grace for some particular end. If, however, any one, placed in certain circumstances, should refuse or neglect to receive some of these sacraments, as, for instance; Confirmation, Penance, the Holy Eucharist, when it is possible for him to receive them, he would lose his soul by refusing obedience to the divine precepts.

The sacraments of Holy Order and Matrimony are necessary for the church, for the perpetuation of the priesthood, and of the society of the faithful, but they are not necessary for each individual.

In all the sacraments there must be found certain elements which compose them, and are indispensable to their existence. These are stated by Pope Eugene IV. in his decree to the Armenians, as follows: "All the sacraments are composed of three parts: of certain sensible things as *matter*, of certain words as *form*, and of the *minister* who confers the sacrament with the intention of doing what the church does; these three things are so essential, that if one be wanting, the sacrament would not exist." This declaration is a state-



ment of the doctrine of the church. There must be found in that which is a sacrament the proper *matter*, the true *form*, and the *qualified minister*. These three things, during the whole period of the church, have been the necessary elements of the sacraments, although as Morinus thinks, the use of these terms only commenced about the year 1215, as previously, doctors and theologians contented themselves with saying, that in the sacraments are found the *Sign* and the *sacred thing*; understanding by the name of *sign*, what is perceived by the senses, and by the name of *sacred thing*, the invisible grace or effect of the sacrament. They understood, as things also required, that there must be a fit minister and a proper subject, and consequently, under different terms, held the same doctrine as is stated in the declaration to the Armenians, which was not only approved by the fathers of the Council of Florence, but afterwards set forth with the consent of the whole church.

The *matter* of the sacrament, being that which is perceptible to the senses, may be found in words, as well as in things, chosen for this end by the author of the sacraments, and it has been his will to use words as the sign or sensible thing in the sacraments of Penance and Matrimony. So also the *form* is to be found in words, but not as they are merely signs or perceptible to the sense of hearing, but in the signification of those words, and in the consecrating force or energy which the author of the sacraments gives to those words. Hence it is said the sacraments consist of things and words. "The word," says St. Augustine, "is joined to the element and it becomes a sacrament."\* "By the words 'sensible thing,' therefore, the Fathers understood not only the matter or element, such as water in baptism, chrism in confirmation, and oil in extreme unction, all of which fall under the eye; but also the words which constitute the *form*, and which are addressed to the ear. Both are pointed out by the Apostle, when he says;

---

\* Aug. In Joan. tract 80.

‘Christ loved the church, and delivered himself for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life.’ (Ephes. v: 25.) Here the matter and form of the sacrament are expressly mentioned. But in order to explain, more fully and clearly, the particular efficacy of each, the words which compose the form were to be added to the matter; for of all signs words are evidently the most significant, and without them it would be difficult to comprehend what the matter of the sacraments may designate and declare.”\* So that we see, while the *form* is placed in words, words as signs may also belong to the matter, and the form of words being joined with the matter by the proper minister, the sacrament exists, and the words show clearly what is the thing signified and the grace conferred. Each sacrament has its appropriate matter and form which constitute its substance, and as the sacraments are all of divine institution, the matter and form must have been determined by Jesus Christ. The *things* and the *words* necessary for the sacraments have been at all times necessary from their institution, and if not specially, at least in a general way, must have been indicated by the Saviour to his Apostles, and by them delivered to the church.

The principal ceremonies with which the sacraments are solemnly administered, considered apart from those which pertain to the essence and are of divine institution, have been nearly all used in the church from the very days of the Apostles. They are designed as a protection to that which is essential; and in order to instruct Christians as to the deplorable condition to which they were reduced by sin, and from which they are rescued by the grace of God; and to impress them with sentiments of gratitude for the favors which they receive, and teach them how they should deport themselves in their union of life with Jesus Christ.

The great ends for which the Son of God became incarnate, being the salvation of men to be effected by

---

\* Cat. Council. Trent. Part. 2d on the Sacraments.

the immolation of Himself as victim, and by the application to individuals of the merits of His passion and death, through graces that would cleanse and sanctify and fit them for the friendship of God, and for union with Him during eternity, the sacraments were instituted as symbols and channels of divine grace. Their final end, therefore, is eternal union with God. Man was entirely vitiated and depraved, that is to say, in his intellect, in his heart, and in his senses, or his body, and it was the purpose of the Saviour to restore him in all the parts of his being, and not only to unite his intellect with him by faith, and his heart by charity, but also to take possession of his body, by that ineffable mystery known as Holy Communion, in which the incarnate God condescends to become one with the Christian in the strictest possible union, by making him "*participator of the divine nature.*"\* He wishes the Christian to be able truly to say with the Apostle: "And I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me."† "In the Eucharist," says Bossuet, "the Son of God, taking the flesh of each of us, communicates to our being the divine qualities of his own, and thus attains the final end of religion on earth." Hence St. Thomas remarks: "The Eucharist is as the consummation of spiritual life, and the end of all the sacraments."‡ For, he tells us: "All the sacraments have reference to the Eucharist; Baptism renders us capable of the Eucharistic union; confirmation maintains it, or makes us more worthy of it; Penance effaces sin, which disrupts it, and replaces us in a condition to contract the alliance again; Extreme Unction, the admirable supplement of Penance, removes all obstacles that might prevent it, or finishes to consolidate it at the hour of death; Order and Matrimony perpetuate it, by perpetuating the church, that is, the priests who keep Jesus Christ ever present on the earth, and the faithful who receive him."§ For this end is all else in religion de-

---

\* 2 Pet. i: 4. † Gal. ii: 20. ‡ St. Thom. Part III. quest. 73, Art. 3. § Ibid, in loco. cit.

signed, to unite men to God in the church, that after death they may be united with him during eternity.

How noble therefore are the sacraments! To what a dignity do they elevate man, if he properly appreciate and use them! And who can estimate their influence upon the individual and upon society? The miseries and disorders in society, the crimes and horrors, which render the history of humanity so dark and revolting, may, in its ultimate reason, be found in man's want of proper respect for himself and for his fellow men. A proper respect for oneself prevents self degradation, and in consequence protects the rights and dignity of others. But when man ceases to care for himself, he readily sinks into every meanness and disgrace, and respects no rights or interests in his fellow men, but even seems to have a malignant pleasure in bringing others down to the level of his own degradation. When you know that any one has ceased to respect or care for himself, you are no longer astonished to learn that he has been guilty of any possible wickedness.

But fallen man is restored by religion, and the essence of religion is man's redemption by the Passion and death of Jesus Christ, the merits of which are given to individuals through faith, hope, charity, and the sacraments. Man is rescued from the state of sin and condemnation, is washed, cleansed, and signed as child of God, is told that he is heir of heaven, is permitted to live on "the bread of Angels," and taught to restrain his passions, contemn perishable and transitory goods and pleasures, and aspire to the glory and happiness of God's kingdom. Called child of God, he is admonished to become holy like to his Father, holy in mind, holy in heart, holy in the senses of the body, which are signed, anointed, and blessed by the sacraments. His dignity is thus revealed to him, he is taught to respect himself, and in all the circumstances of his life to act consistently with his dignity of character as co-heir with Jesus Christ.

Sacraments have been provided by the Saviour in number to suit the needs of men. This is the reason,



so beautifully given by the author of the catechism of the Council of Trent, why they are precisely seven in number. "Why they are neither more nor less," he writes, "may be shown, at least with some degree of probability, even from the analogy that exists between natural and spiritual life. In order to exist, to preserve existence, and to contribute to his own and the public good, seven things seem necessary to man—to be born—to grow—to be nurtured—to be cured when sick—when weak to be strengthened—as far as regards the public weal, to have magistrates invested with authority to govern—and finally to perpetuate himself and his species by legitimate offspring. Analogous then as all these things obviously are, to that life by which the soul lives to God, we discover in them a reason for the number of the sacraments." The author then proceeds to exhibit, how by Baptism, man is born again to Christ; by confirmation, grows and is strengthened in the grace of God; by the Holy Eucharist, is fed and nourished unto eternal life; by Penance, is cured of his spiritual wounds; by Extreme Unction, is invigorated and cleansed even from any remaining traces of sin; how by Holy Order, ministers are provided for administering the sacraments and performing all sacred functions in the church; and finally, how by the sacrament of Matrimony, the union of man and woman is made holy for the conservation of the human race, and the education of children in the knowledge of religion, and the love and fear of God.\*

The reason why our Lord attached these graces to sensible signs, is in harmony with that which induced him to make himself visible to man by assuming the human nature. It is the nature of man, composed of body as well as soul, that rendered it necessary for him to have a religion, not purely spiritual, but also sensible and external; that his whole being might be consecrated to the service of his creator. And, in his fallen condition, his intellect had become so deeply subjected to his

---

\* Cat. Counc. Trent, Part 2d, on the Sacraments.



senses that he seemed to know and believe nothing but what he could see, touch, or in some way grasp by his senses. He had, as it were, become *carnalized*. In this condition he was to be sought by the divine restorer, and elevated to a high spiritual destiny. And through the senses, he had to be conducted from darkness into light, from the carnal to the spiritual, from the visible to the invisible, from ignorance unto the evidence of faith, and from faith to intelligence of supernatural things. His physical life depends upon the articles of his food, his intellectual life upon the signs of thought, upon spoken and written language, and his religious or spiritual life is made to depend upon the divinely instituted sacramental signs, which signify and bestow divine grace, which is the life of his soul. To his religious life, the sacraments are as necessary, as is language to his intellectual life, or food to his physical existence. He can despise them only at his peril, for without them he can neither become the child of God, nor secure a title to eternal life. It is then a proof as well of the divine wisdom, as of the mercy of God, that he has given to man, means, for securing eternal happiness, that are in entire harmony with his nature and his wants, and means the more in harmony with the omnipotence, which operates the greatest wonders "with the weak and little things of the world to confound the strong,"\* because, to profit by them, men are compelled to conquer their pride, and subject themselves in submissive obedience to God's authority and will.

We have already manifested that these sacraments are not all of equal necessity. Baptism, Penance, and Holy Order are of paramount necessity, but from different causes. Neither are these sacraments all of equal dignity and excellence. This is a dogma of faith defined by the church.† With respect to their dignity, it is to be held that the Holy Eucharist, for its holiness, and for the number and greatness of its myste-

---

\* 1 Cor. i: 27. † Counc. Trent, Sess. VII. Can. 3.

ries, is eminently superior to all the rest. In the order usually observed, our attention will be directed to the consideration of each of these sacraments separately.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

OF BAPTISM—ITS MATTER AND FORM—ITS NECESSITY—ITS EFFECTS—ITS MINISTER—OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM—ITS CEREMONIES.

Baptism is the first sacrament to be received. It is “the *door* of spiritual life.”\* The word signifies *ablution* or *immersion*, and comes from the Greek *baptizo*. The purification of the body by water is a fit symbol of the purification of the soul. Baptism may be defined: “A sacrament of the new law, instituted for effacing original sin and regenerating us in Jesus Christ;” or as given in the catechism of the Council of Trent: “The sacrament of regeneration by water in the word.”

### *Of the Matter and Form of Baptism.*

The last of the above definitions indicates the matter and form of this sacrament, and the new birth into the life of grace. All natural water is the matter of this sacrament, and artificial waters or other liquids are of no avail for it. Our Saviour says: “Unless any one is born again of *water* and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.”† His words are precise, and the necessity of using natural water clearly enjoined. The form, in the words to be used, has been indicated by our Saviour in his command: “to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the

---

\* Eug. iv: Decree for the Armenians. † John iii: 5.

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." \* Therefore the form is: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," as used by the Catholic Church, which in substance is the same with that used by the Greeks: "N—— is baptized by our hands in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The express and distinct invocation of the three persons of the holy Trinity is absolutely necessary, the holy Trinity being the principal cause from which the virtue of baptism proceeds. The minister must indicate himself as the instrumental cause, and also indicate the subject who is baptized. All these are found in the form: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

#### *Necessity of Baptism.*

The gospel of St. Mathew records the commission which our Lord gave to his Apostles, to teach all nations the doctrines which He had delivered to them, and to unite them to His church and to himself as its head, by "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." † The command is so plain, and the declaration so precise that those will be condemned who will not believe the gospel; "he that believeth not shall be condemned—" ‡ that is, those who will not be instructed, and enter by baptism into obedience to Christ and union with Him, will be condemned; and it is also so plainly said: "Unless any one is born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God," § that it is most extraordinary that any person, who believes in the Christian religion, should deny the absolute necessity of baptism. It is true, Christians of all denominations do not object to term baptism a sacrament, but many attach no great importance to it even as a thing sacred, and most of them do not admit that it is absolutely

---

\* Math. xxviii : 19. † Math. xxviii : 19. ‡ Mark xvi : 16. § John iii : 5.

necessary for salvation. It is of faith, that it is absolutely necessary for salvation since *the promulgation of the Gospel*. This necessity extends to all persons, to infants as well as adults. The church only recognizes two exceptional cases, in which the want of actual baptism is supplied, when it is impossible to receive it, and these cases suppose at least an implicit desire to receive it. The first case is, where a person, not being able to receive baptism *actually*, is at the point of death, and has the grace of perfect charity, with sorrow for his sins, and a desire to receive the sacrament of baptism. Many theologians consider that this desire should be *explicit*, others think that an *implicit* desire will suffice, but this is not certain; and far less probable is that opinion, which some have held, that such implicit desire may possibly be found in those who *bona fide* refuse baptism, thinking falsely that it is only some sort of spiritual baptism by fire and the Holy Ghost, that is pleasing to God, and yet are disposed to do all that God requires. If such a case may have existed, there is no means by which men can determine whether the person secured salvation, but judgment thereon is with Him, who declared that regeneration by water and the Holy Ghost is necessary. An actual desire to comply with the law, when it is not possible to do so, is accepted by God for the act, but it seems a difficult, if not an impossible thing, for such a desire to exist simultaneously with an actual rejection of baptism: The perfect charity which should be found with this desire is an extraordinary grace, and places the person in a condition of friendship and reconciliation with God, and is a disposition to do the holy will of God in all things, and to detest and avoid all that gives Him offence and displeasure. This reconciliation, without baptism actually received, is termed the baptism of desire, or *baptisma flaminis*, and is a compliance with the law of baptism, as far as possible in the circumstances. In the first centuries, when the church subjected catechumens to such a long probation before admitting them to baptism, such cases might and did frequently



arise, and have happened, and no doubt do still occur, in our own times, but it is very perilous for persons to neglect baptism when in their power to receive it, under a notion that its benefits may be thus supplied to them at their last moments. In the judgment of God, so inscrutable, they may be deprived of the grace of repentance and charity, and their desire prove vain and insufficient.\*

The second exceptional case, in which the want of actual baptism is supplied, is martyrdom for the sake of Jesus Christ: "He that loseth his life for me shall find it." † This is an act of perfect faith and heroic devotion, the giving up of all things from love of God; an act of perfect charity, and includes a disposition to obey God in all that he requires. It is entirely different from the suffering of death because of pride of opinion, of which among heretics there have been examples, and which are tributes paid by men to their own reason and courage, and not acts of devotion and love to Jesus Christ from the promptings of faith. In times of persecution, many were called by martyrdom to salvation and the crown of glory, by miraculous and sudden conversions, when witnessing the death of other martyrs, and, having no possibility of baptism, desired to do all that God required through his church, and, in their own blood, were washed, cleansed, baptized. Hence, this is called the baptism of blood, *baptisma sanguinis*. With these exceptions, the law rests upon all who have had the opportunity to know the gospel of Jesus Christ, and who are required "to believe and be baptized," or as St. Peter exhorts: They have to "do penance and be baptized, each one, for the remission of

---

\* Those who, in the early ages of the church, presented themselves to be received, were placed under instruction, and called Catechumens, of whom there were three classes. Their time of probation was for eight months, one year, two years, and even, in some parts, three years. They had their special sponsors to see to their instruction, besides the catechists, and were allowed to be present at the first part of the mass, and until after the sermon. Their lives were the subject of great scrutiny. When persecutions raged, the term of their probation was abridged, and baptism given sooner. † Math. x: 39, and Mark viii: 35.



their sins.”\* And it is a law which reaches even to those who are yet unable to know and believe the gospel; it extends to infants, from the moment of their entrance into this world, because they come into the world as “children of wrath,” having the stain and guilt of original sin, and being in a state of separation from God, and subjected to the sentence of temporal and eternal death, which God decreed against all the posterity of the first transgressors of his commandment and will, and, notwithstanding the passion and death of Him who died for all, they must remain in this state of separation from God, until they receive the inestimable blessing of a new birth, by water and the Holy Ghost. Those who consult only their pride of reason, and are unwilling to accept the teachings of faith, reject the doctrine of original sin; and those who merely consult their sensibility and their false notion of the innocence of infants, think it cruel to suppose that they do not go immediately to heaven, even though dying without baptism. Infants are innocent of all actual transgression of God’s law and of all actual sin; but because of that solidarity of the race, which God has made a law, they are held to be guilty, and will inherit the consequences of that guilt in an eternal separation from God, if parents will not suffer them to come to God by that spiritual birth, which he has provided for them in the waters of baptism. It is not merely the first parents who incurred the taint and forfeiture from rebellion against the sovereign, but the whole family of man is under the attainder and reached by the confiscation, and the door of restoration is thrown open on condition of being “born of God,” † through the infusion of the blood of Jesus Christ by the channel of baptism. The Saviour wishes little children to come to him, and declares that of such is the Kingdom of God, but he recognizes it to be in the power of others to allow or prevent it: “Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of

---

\* Acts ii : 38. † John i : 13.

God."\* They can "suffer them to come," by bringing them to the waters of baptism; they can prevent or "forbid them," by neglecting to secure this blessing for them from their own indifference or unbelief, but they cannot, by their opinions, change the law, which he has made, requiring them to be born again. Just as the infidel sneers at the idea of all the consequences of original sin being the result of "eating an apple," they say, what need for the use of a little water by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion? What difference can such a ceremony make in the destiny of man for eternity? As if obedience to God's positive command were not a thing of supreme importance, and a refusal to obey, a rebellion against the sovereign will of God. It is reasonable to ask, if God gave such a command, and imposed such a condition, but it is very unreasonable to say, that any thing he has commanded is not of utility, not necessary, or, because we do not see its utility, to conclude that, therefore, God did not command it.

If, according to revelation, we declare that the redemption by Jesus Christ was necessary in order to rescue mankind from sin and hell, an infidel may not see this necessity, and in his opinion, may suppose that men could equally as well escape sin and hell without such redemption. If we declare that it is of faith, that the merits of this redemption must be applied to men by means of faith and the sacraments, a deist may not see the necessity of any such application, and suppose that men can go to heaven without it, and even those who claim to be Christians, may suppose that Jesus Christ has done all for them, and that they can obtain all merely by putting their confidence in him, without troubling themselves about points of faith or the church. Also, many may be of opinion that not only unbaptized infants are received into union with God and enjoy eternal beatitude, but also that it is a very illiberal and harsh creed which declares that they cannot enter the kingdom of God. But there remains the revelation of God,

---

\* Mark x: 14.

saying, that "there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved," than that of our Lord Jesus Christ, and no salvation except on the conditions he imposes, of which he has declared that one is, a new birth by water and the Holy Ghost.

The church has always understood that this law extends to infants as well as to adults. Two Œcumenical Councils have expressed themselves clearly on this point, viz: the second Council of Lyons, and the Council of Florence; the latter, in the decree *for union*, taking the words found in the confession of Faith of Michael Palacologus made in the first named council, in the name of the Greek church: "We believe that the souls of those who die in mortal sin, or only in original sin, descend forthwith to hell, to be punished however with unequal punishments," or pains, *pœnis tamen disparibus puniendas*. It is then of faith that unbaptized infants go to hell, and it is also of faith that their punishment is *unequal* to what is inflicted on adult sinners. Unbaptized infants are therefore lost because of original sin, and from not having been born again by baptism. As to what place in hell they hold, or what are the pains they have to endure, or precisely what constitutes the *disparity* of their pains as compared with those of adult sinners, the decree does not say, and nothing has been proposed as of faith. Theologians agreeing, as faith requires, that they are excluded from the kingdom of heaven and deprived of the vision and enjoyment of God, discuss the question whether these unbaptized infants suffer the pains of sense, that is whether besides the loss of God and of eternal beatitude, they suffer from the fires of hell, prepared for the devil and his angels, and awarded by the justice of God as the portion of voluntary, unrepenting sinners. Some, with St. Augustine and other fathers, have held the opinion that they do suffer something of the pains of sense, but that their suffering is *the mildest and slightest of all*. Others, with St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Gregory of Nyssa, have held that their pain is only that of the loss of God and privation of heaven.

And, even among those who thought their punishment only consisted of the loss of God and heaven, there were different opinions as to how they are affected by this loss. Some, with Bellarmine, thinking that they are afflicted with a certain sadness arising from the privation of the beatific vision, while others, with St. Thomas, deny that they suffer sadness from such privation. The opinion of some, with Sfrondratus, held that they are in a condition of natural happiness. This last opinion others have incorrectly classed with the error of the Pelagians, while it is very different, since Sfrondatus, and those of his way of thinking, taught that these children, though having a kind of natural felicity, really suffered the *pain of loss*, or underwent *damnation* because of original sin, while the Pelagian error attributed this natural beatitude, to infants dying unbaptized, as the natural condition of these infants, excluding the belief of the *death of sin*, and the belief that the privation of the vision of God is damnation. Therefore, Pope Pius VI. in his dogmatic constitution, *Auctorem fidei*, has declared that it is false and rash to pretend to confound with the error of the Pelagians, the opinion, which frees from the pains of hell fire, those who die without baptism, and guilty only of original sin. But opinions may exist where the church has not defined, and the church has only to defend what she teaches. Persons are free to consider existence a blessing to those unbaptized infants, although from not being baptized, they are deprived of that which cannot be estimated. They may, with St. Thomas, consider them as having certain natural goods and a sort of natural love for God, and gladness, without suffering any pains of sense. But they must receive the teaching of the church, viz: that they are excluded from the kingdom of God and supernatural beatitude forever.

“If,” says St. Augustine, “you wish to be a Catholic, do not believe, do not say, do not teach, that infants, who die before being baptized, can obtain the remission of original sin;”\* and elsewhere he writes:

---

\* Lib. iii. de Orig. Animæ.



“Whoever says, that infants themselves are made alive in Jesus Christ, when they die without having partaken of the sacrament of baptism, opposes directly all that the Apostles have preached: he condemns *the whole church*, in which they hasten to baptize little infants, because they believe that these infants cannot otherwise have life in Jesus Christ.”\* Moreover, it has always been the practice of the church to baptize infants immediately after their birth; which shows her belief that, because of original sin, they could not enter into heaven, if they should die without baptism.† Where the gospel has not been promulgated, and the law of baptism could not be known, persons cannot be in any worse condition than men were before the establishment of Christianity, but must have the same possibility and means of salvation as they had, but it is the office of the church to let all persons know the absolute necessity of baptism wherever she promulgates the gospel of salvation, and she announces this necessity in distinct terms. How criminal then are parents who delay or neglect altogether the baptism of their children, and how foolish the persons who, despising this condition of salvation, even though they have read and heard the express words of Jesus Christ that: “unless a person is born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,” live and die without caring to receive this sacrament!

Infants can receive baptism, which removes the stain of sin from their souls, just as they received the stain of sin without any co-operation of their own; but adults, or those who have sufficient reason, must wish and consent to be baptized in order to receive the sacrament validly. To obtain its fruits they must have a sufficient knowledge of the principal truths of religion, and entertain sentiments of faith, of hope, of contrition for their sins, and some commencement of charity, or the love of God.

---

\* Letter CLXVI.

† Counc. Trent, Sess. VII, Can. V.



*Of the Effects of Baptism.*

The chief effects of the sacrament of baptism are the grace which regenerates us in Jesus Christ, and the character which this sacrament imprints on the soul. The effect of the sanctifying grace, given in baptism, is the effacing of all sin, original and actual, and the remission of all penalty due to sin, with the infusion of virtues and spiritual gifts.\*

*Sanctifying Grace the First Effect of Baptism.*

This sacrament confers sanctifying grace on those who receive it worthily, purifying them from all past actual sins as well as from original sin, and rendering them agreeable to God. Besides effacing all previous sins, it removes all the penalty or spiritual pains due to those sins. The sanctifying grace received in baptism is accompanied with the infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost, and there is also given the *sacramental* grace, which strengthens the soul to combat concupiscence, and fulfill the obligations of the Christian. But ignorance, concupiscence, subjection to the miseries of life, and to temporal death, are not removed by baptism.

*Of the Character—The Second Effect of Baptism.*

The character, imparted by baptism, is an indelible mark or invisible spiritual sign, which is as it were the seal of the children of God. To this the Apostle refers, in writing to the Ephesians: "in whom (Christ) you also believing, you were *signed* with the Holy Spirit of promise."† And again: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby you are *sealed* unto the day of redemption."‡ The sign being indelible, baptism can only be received once. We can cease to be worthy

---

\* See Council of Trent, Sess. V. No. 5, on Orig. Sin. † Eph. i: 13.  
‡ Eph. iv: 30.

children of God by sin, but we can never cease to bear the seal, which He imprints on the souls of his children, begotten to Him through Jesus Christ. The Council of Trent pronounces anathema against any one who denies that in baptism there is imprinted in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which it cannot be repeated.\*

### *The Minister and Mode of Baptism.*

As the commission to teach all nations, and to "baptize them" was given by Jesus Christ to his Apostles, it is clear that their successors, the ministers of Jesus Christ, are the *ordinary* ministers of baptism; but it is of faith, that any person, male or female, Catholic or not Catholic, can validly, and in case of necessity, even lawfully, confer baptism. The church holds, that as baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation, God will ed to facilitate its reception, and, choosing natural water as the matter thereof to be found every where, he allows it to be validly administered by every body, so that, if men should act rightly, few would die without baptism. As any one may find himself in the case to have to administer baptism, all should make it their study to know how to administer it. The essential part is, that the person who baptizes should say all the words of the form properly, and at the same time should himself pour the water on the head of the person as an ablution. The custom, used in the church, is to pour the water in the form of the cross three times, once while naming each of the persons of the Holy Trinity, and the greatest care is to be taken to use the words: "*I baptize thee,*" &c. The church recognizes, that the application of the water as an *ablution* may be made in three different ways for baptism, and yet the baptism be *valid*; viz: by immersion, by pouring, and by aspersion or sprinkling. There must be enough water applied to the person to be an emblem of the washing or cleansing

---

\* Sess. VII., Can. IX, on Sac. in Gen.

of the soul. Immersion seems, from the expression of the Apostle, of being "buried with Christ by baptism in the likeness of his death," and from testimonies in certain works of some of the early fathers, to have been the mode most commonly used at first, but at a very early day, the mode by pouring began to be found most convenient in many cases, and in the course of several centuries became of almost general observance.\* At present it is not lawful, at least in the Western portion of the church, for the individual minister to use any but this mode by pouring, which the church has

---

\* Some persons pretend, from the Greek word, *baptizo*, to derive an argument for immersion as the only mode of baptism proper and efficient. But the word means other modes of washing as well as that by plunging or dipping the body. In the book of Ecclesiasticus xxxiv: 25, it is used to signify the legal purification necessary after becoming unclean by touching a corpse, and this purification was effected by being sprinkled with the water of expiation, as may be seen in Numbers xix: 13. In the time of our Saviour, the Jews, on coming from the market place, were accustomed to baptize themselves, Mark vii: 4, most probably by dipping their hands in water. St. Paul calls the various kinds of legal purification *baptisms*, Heb. ix: 10, although several of them were effected by mere aspersions. The same use of the word for washings, that were not immersions, can also be shown in works of profane writers. See *Lexicon II. Stephani*. Those in the early period of the church, who were baptized when sick in bed, and who were called *clinics*, were not baptized by immersion, and yet were held to be validly baptized. No one ventured to re baptize such Christians; and St. Cyprian, in his Epistle LXXVI, replies to a question which some one had addressed to him to know if such baptisms were valid, calling it "the divine compendium," he averred that it is a true baptism, and confers all on believers. Both modes were then in use in the early church, and the word in Greek allows both meanings, and therefore the Greek can furnish no proof, for an exclusive use of immersion in baptism. While the mode by immersion may have been the one most in use at first, when those baptized were most commonly adults, it is not certain that even at first it was the only mode. It is not probable that the Apostles immersed the three thousand persons whom they baptized in one day, nor is it probable that St. Paul immersed the jailor and his family when he baptized them in prison; and, when in progress of time, after the establishment of the church, most of persons were baptized in their infancy, it happened that the mode by immersion was gradually discontinued. The practice of the church, founded upon the ancient doctrine and usage in the administration of baptism, ought to be held as sufficient to clear up any supposed difficulty on this point.

selected and prescribed. In this mode, there is applied a sufficiency of water to symbolize the washing of the soul, and it is easy to use it under all circumstances. Immersion is not, for persons under some circumstances, or in some places, convenient, or safe, and in aspersion, there is danger of not applying to the body any water when the baptism would be invalid, or a sufficiency to be a type of washing, in which case the baptism would at best be doubtful. The church has then wisely adopted the mode by pouring, which is the one to be used when this sacrament is administered.

### *Of the Ceremonies.*

The other ceremonies, prescribed and performed in the solemn administration of baptism, do not pertain to the essence of this sacrament, but are most impressive and instructive, and, as demonstrated from testimonies of the Fathers, are of the highest antiquity, and to be referred to Apostolical tradition. In these ceremonies the church shows, with what dispositions, the unregenerated are to seek to be enrolled among the children of God, by this sacred rite. She demands from the candidate: "What dost thou ask of the Church of God?" to which his reply is: "Faith." And here, on the very threshold, by this inquiry, the church gives a profound instruction, in conformity with what is taught by the Apostle St. Paul, when he declares, that "faith cometh by hearing," viz: that it is, from the church of Jesus Christ, that men are to receive belief of the divine truths which God has revealed. It is the office of the church, through her ministers, to preach the gospel of salvation. The candidate is then asked: "What will faith avail thee?" He answers: "Life everlasting." And he is then told, in the words of Jesus Christ: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," and enjoined to love God with all his heart and soul, and his neighbour as himself. The exorcisms manifest to him the sad condition of his birth in a state of sin, and as "a child of wrath," while the



other prayers with the signings of the cross, announce that, through the passion and death of Christ, he is to be restored. He is to receive the grace of God, of which the sacred oil is an emblem, and with it, on the breast and shoulders, he is anointed in the form of a cross, to remind him that, with God's grace and the strength that it will give him, he is to love as well as carry the cross daily, and follow in the footsteps of Jesus Christ. He is required to profess his faith by the recital of the creed drawn up by the Apostles, his belief in the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in whose name he is to receive a new birth. He is made to taste salt, the emblem of wisdom and preservation, while a prayer is offered for him, that, henceforward, he may *thirst* after the heavenly food, and in serving God, "be fervent in spirit and rejoicing in hope." He is signed with the sign of the cross in token of his faith in Christ crucified, and also signed with saliva in memorial, that he, who, using this, cured the deaf and dumb, will also for him remove all spiritual deafness, and loosen his tongue in the praise of God. He is required to renounce the Devil, his works, and pomps, and earnestly take part with God, against whose honor and glory all the efforts of the devil are directed. "The laver of regeneration, with the Word of life," is then applied to him, and he is renewed in life by the power of the Holy Ghost. As a sign of his being aggregated to the royal priesthood of Jesus Christ, he is anointed on the crown of his head with holy chrism, the white robe is placed on him, as an emblem of his robes washed white in the blood of Christ, and he is warned, "to carry it without stain before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and, to declare to him what is now expected from him, the lighted taper, the emblem of good works, is placed in his hand, and this light admonishes him that he must not only let his light shine before men, that they may see his good works, and glorify God, his Father, but that if he have not oil in his lamp, even though exempt from certain vices, he may be excluded from the feast of the bridegroom, as were the foolish virgins. Finally, he is told to "go



in peace." It is thus, that an immortal being enters upon a new career, and, when already an adult at the time this transformation or renewal is accomplished, he is made able by faith and grace to behold, beyond the mists and darkness of the present life, the opened gates of God's celestial kingdom, and is filled with the high and consoling hopes of one day entering it, as co-heir of Jesus Christ, to possess endless joys and unfading glories as an eternal inheritance. Happy the one who can present to God the title of his baptismal innocence preserved!

Before concluding the present chapter, it may be of utility to say a few words concerning the sponsors required to assist the candidate for baptism. The custom of having sponsors prevailed in the earliest ages of the church. Tertullian, in his book on baptism, makes mention of them, and refers to the responsibility which they assume. If they were customary in those days, when adults came forward able to answer for themselves, they are still more necessary for infants, who cannot give promises of fidelity, but stand in need of some one to watch over them and instruct them in the doctrines of faith and in the ways of virtue. The faith of the sponsors is received as that of the children for whom they stand, and it is their duty to see their God-children brought up according to the pledge they have given for them, and prepared and willing to renew their promises when able to do so. These sponsors were termed *susceptores*, *receivers*, because they received the baptized person as he came forth from the waters, in which he was newly born. At first, several were allowed to act in this capacity, but the Council of Trent has restricted the number, saying: "One person only, whether male or female, or at most one male and one female shall receive in baptism the individual baptized." The reason for this restriction is the impediment to marriage, which arises from the spiritual relationship or affinity produced by baptism. The council says: "between whom (the sponsors) and the baptized, and the father and mother thereof; as also between the

person baptizing and the baptized, and the father and mother of the baptized; and these only; shall spiritual relationship be contracted."\*

This impediment of affinity, which may arise either from the sacrament of baptism, or from that of confirmation, by ecclesiastical law prevents marriage from being valid, unless a dispensation has been obtained. The Council of Trent strictly enjoins upon priests who have conferred baptism, "to register the names of the sponsors, and to teach them what relationship they have contracted, that they may not have any excuse on the score of ignorance." †

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

OF CONFIRMATION—ITS MATTER AND FORM—ITS EFFECTS—ITS MINISTER—ITS NECESSITY—ITS SUBJECT.

The Saviour, when about to leave his Apostles and ascend to his Father, promised to send the Holy Ghost upon them in order to give them strength to be fearless witnesses for him and his doctrines, and to teach them all truth, that they might be able to teach the same to the nations of the earth. The Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, and gave to them numerous graces and miraculous gifts. These were of two kinds; some to qualify them to plant the church and to convert men, others to sanctify them still more, and make them models for a holy life. The Holy Ghost was conferred upon the Apostles in an extraordinary and exceptional manner. They represented the church of Christ, and received the Charismata, or gifts of the Holy Ghost, such as the power of mira-

---

\* Sess. xxiv : ch. 2d. † Ibid.

cles, the gift of tongues, prophecy, &c., for the benefit of others. They also received graces for themselves personally. In the first period of the church, the Apostles, by means of "the imposition of hands," conferred the Holy Ghost, and these exterior and extraordinary gifts were also manifested in those upon whom they imposed hands, but they were gifts designed to assist in establishing the faith, and extending the limits of the church. They were less frequently bestowed in proportion as the need for them decreased. Yet the sacrament of the Holy Ghost, which is a visible, sensible sign of invisible grace, continued to be administered for the growth and perfection of individual Christians, as intended by the Saviour, when he instituted it; sanctifying grace to fortify and strengthen the soul, and not the Charismata, or gifts to persons for the benefit of others, was the ordinary effect contemplated. This sacrament is commonly known as *confirmation*. It may be defined: "A sacrament, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, which communicates to us the plenitude of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, renders us perfect Christians and soldiers of Jesus Christ, and gives us strength to confess the faith even at the peril of our lives." Upon the first converts, this sacrament was conferred immediately after baptism, but it was held to be a different sacrament; as remarked by the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "The diversity of the grace which each sacrament confers, and the diversity of the external sign employed to signify that grace, obviously constitute them different sacraments. As by the grace of baptism we are begotten to newness of life, and by confirmation grow to full maturity, having put away the things of a child, we can hence sufficiently comprehend that the same difference which exists in the natural order between birth and growth, exists also in the supernatural, between baptism which regenerates, and confirmation which imparts full growth and perfect spiritual strength."\* It is of faith that confirmation

---

\* Cat. Coun. Trent, on Confirmation.

is a true sacrament, instituted by Jesus Christ. The holy Scriptures furnish proofs of this doctrine. In the Acts, c.° viii: v. 14, we read: "Now when the Apostles, that were in Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent to them Peter and John; who, when they were come, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For, he was not, as yet, come upon any of them; but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them; and they received the Holy Ghost." Also in the xix chap. of Acts, v. 5, &c., we read thus: "Having heard these things, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had imposed his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." Thus was this sacrament administered by the Apostles by a sensible sign, which conferred the Holy Ghost, showing that it is an institution of Jesus Christ, who only could give to a sensible sign this power. It is, therefore, really a sacrament, and, as such, has been in constant use in the church since the days of the Apostles. The Council of Trent declares: "If any one saith, that the confirmation of those who have been baptized is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper sacrament; Let him be anathema."\*

### *The Matter and Form.*

This sacrament is conferred by an imposition of hands with prayer, and by an unction on the forehead of the recipient with chrism, composed of olive oil and fragrant balsam blessed for the purpose by the Bishop, and applied with the words: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In his second epistle to the Corinthians, c. 1: v. 29, the Apostle is understood to refer to this sacrament when he says; "Now he that *confirmeth* us

---

\* Sess. vii: can. 1, on confirm.



with you in Christ, and that hath *anointed us*, is God, who also hath *sealed us*, and given the *pledge of the Spirit* in our hearts." The external unction with chrism is the emblem of the internal unction of the Holy Ghost. "It is necessary," writes St. Cyprian, "that he who has been baptized, should be moreover, anointed; in order that having received *the chrism*, that is the unction, he may be anointed in God; and possess the grace of Christ."\* Again he says: "Our custom is that those who have been baptized in the church should be presented to the bishops, and by our prayer and the imposition of the hand, receive the Holy Ghost, and be *marked with the seal* of the Lord."† The Fathers speak of this sacrament under different names, such as "the imposition of hands," "the imposition of the hand," "the sacrament of chrism," "the seal of spiritual unction," "the consummation of the Christian," and "confirmation." The act of the unction with chrism requires at the same time an imposition of the hand. Hence, while all agree as to the doctrine of the church, certain theologians differ from the commonly received opinion as to the matter and form of this sacrament, imagining these to be found in the first imposition of hands and accompanying prayer, instead of in the imposition of the hand while making the unction with chrism, and the words: "I sign thee," &c., as before cited. The catechism of the Council of Trent says: "The matter of confirmation is chrism, a word borrowed from the Greek language, and which although used by profane writers to designate any sort of ointment, is appropriated, by ecclesiastical usage, to signify ointment composed of olive oil and balsam, and solemnly consecrated by the Episcopal benediction. A mixture of oil and balsam therefore constitutes the matter of confirmation."‡ It also says: "The form of confirmation consists of these words; 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism

---

\* Cyp. Ep. LXX. † Cyp. Ep. LXXIII. ‡ Cat. Counc. Trent, p. 185. Translation.

of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Pope Eugenius IV. in his decree to the Armenians, declares: "that chrism made from oil and balsam, blessed by the bishop, is the matter of this sacrament." It is the common opinion that the sacred unction pertains to the essential matter of this sacrament, and the imposition of hands to the necessary matter.

### *Of the Effects of Confirmation.*

The effects of this sacrament are grace, and a distinctive mark or character. It is of faith, that this sacrament, confers sanctifying grace, upon those who receive it worthily, from the intrinsic virtue of the rite, *ex opere operato*. It is a grace which increases in us the grace of baptism, and makes us perfect Christians. To this grace is added a sacramental grace proper to this sacrament, the Holy Ghost communicating himself to us and spreading in our souls the interior graces with which he strengthened the first Christians, and particularly the seven gifts attributed to him, as St. Ambrose declares to the one confirmed: "Thou hast received the spiritual seal, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and piety, and the spirit of the fear of God."\* Fortitude is the gift most needed by the Christian, strength to resist temptation, to endure persecution, to combat valiantly and obtain victory. "You shall receive *the power* of the Holy Ghost coming upon you,"† was the gift promised by the Saviour to his Apostles. Confirmation imprints on the soul an indelible sign or seal, and therefore this sacrament can only be received once. This is of faith. St. Paul refers to this sign in his epistle to the Corinthians, 2d Ep. c. i: 22, "who also hath *sealed* us," or marked us with a sign. Therefore St. Ambrose writes: "Thou hast received the *spiritual seal*." The mark impressed

\* Lib. de Mysteriis, c. vii.

† Acts i: 8.

by baptism is that of child of God, the mark given by confirmation is that of soldier of Jesus Christ. That confirmation imprints a character is declared by the Council of Trent, Sess. V. Can. V.

*Of the Minister of Confirmation.*

A bishop is the ordinary minister of the sacrament of confirmation, as proved by the constant practice of the church, and by various declarations of Popes and of the Council of Trent. With special powers from the sovereign Pontif, however, a priest may be the extraordinary minister of this sacrament. In these cases, he must use chrism which has been consecrated by a bishop. Confirmation administered by a priest, without having received authorization from the vicar of Jesus Christ, would be null. The Council of Trent declares: "If any one saith, that the ordinary minister of confirmation is not the bishop alone, but any simple priest soever; Let him be anathema."\*

*Of the Necessity of Confirmation.*

This sacrament is not absolutely necessary for salvation as a *necessary means*, for the person confirmed is supposed to be already in the state of grace, but it is necessary by *command*, and adults are, under pain of sin, obliged to receive it when the occasion is afforded them. Hence, their neglect may be the cause of their missing salvation by the sin they commit, and because of their not having the graces which they could have received from this sacrament, and their falling away in time of trial and combat.

*The Subject of Confirmation.*

Only persons who have been baptized can receive this sacrament. All baptized persons, even infants,

---

\* Sess. VII, Can. III. on Confirm.

may validly receive it, but, in our times, it is considered proper to wait till children have attained the use of reason, before admitting them to be confirmed.

But few ceremonies accompany the administration of this sacrament. After the unction, the bishop gives to the person confirmed a slight blow on the cheek, using the words: "peace be with thee." This shows the nature of the Christian warfare in which the soldier of Jesus Christ is enlisted; it is one of suffering and endurance. He must bear his cross and follow Jesus Christ with patience and fortitude.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST—IT IS A SACRAMENT AND A SACRIFICE.

The most excellent and wonderful of the sacraments is the Holy Eucharist. It not only confers grace but contains and gives the author of grace, Jesus Christ himself. It is the tree of Life, whose fruits confers immortality; more excellent than the manna, which also descended from heaven, it is the bread of life, and "he that eateth this bread shall live forever." To set forth the doctrines of the church regarding this sacrament, we shall observe that every thing depends on the dogma of the true, real, and substantial presence of Jesus Christ, the God-man, under what still appears to the senses to be only bread and wine. And this real presence of Jesus Christ being revealed to the church and held as of faith, the Eucharist which contains him, is to be considered at the same time as a true sacrament and a true sacrifice, the ineffable "mystery of faith," and the "memorial of all the wonderful works of God." The term Eucharist signifies *thanksgiving*, or *good grace*. It is sometimes called the Holy Communion,



the Holy Sacrament, the Sacrament of the Altar, the Synaxis, the Viaticum, the Blessed Sacrament, and even "the Lord's Supper," because it was instituted at the last supper of Jesus Christ with his disciples. Considered comprehensively as regards the doctrines of faith, the Eucharist is the sacrament, and sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, who under the forms and appearances of bread and wine is offered in sacrifice, remains present, and is given to be the spiritual food of men.

As the humanity and divinity of Jesus Christ are united in the divine *hypostasis*, or *personality*, it must be true, that wherever the body of Jesus Christ is, there also must be his divinity, and if his soul should be separated from the body as in time of his death, the divinity must be with both soul and body, and hence in speaking of the presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist, we mean that he is present as he is since his resurrection, the living Christ, body, blood, soul, and divinity. At the time the Eucharist was instituted Jesus Christ saying: "Take, eat, this is my body," "drink ye all of this, for this is the new testament in my blood," caused his body and blood to be present as he then was before his death and resurrection, but when after his resurrection his Apostles, in obedience to his command, did what he had done, and, as his ministers, consecrated and offered the Eucharistic sacrifice, Jesus Christ became present as he is since his resurrection, his body being spiritualized and glorified.

*The Eucharist as a Sacrament—The Real Presence—Transubstantiation—Other Points in the Doctrine—Its Matter and Form—Its Minister—Its Subject—Its Necessity—Its Effects.*

We may define this sacrament as follows: "The Eucharist is a sacrament of the new law which, under the forms and appearances of bread and wine, contains truly, really, and substantially the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has himself

instituted it to be the food and nourishment of our soul." That it is a sacrament; is admitted by nearly all religious denominations. The Catholic church declares this to be an article of divine Faith. It is also of Faith, that Jesus Christ himself instituted it, since he only could place his body, blood, soul, and divinity under the forms and appearances of bread and wine.

The fact of its institution by him is recorded in the gospels,\* and declared by the Apostle St. Paul.† He commanded his Apostles, and (as he designed the institution for the benefit of men till the consummation of the world) their successors, the Bishops, and all who should be ordained to be his priests and ministers, to "do for a commemoration of him," what he had just done himself.‡

By this definition it is seen, that it is of Faith that what is contained under the forms and appearances, or accidental qualities of bread and wine is the body, blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, and not the substance of bread and wine as before consecration. Hence the doctrine teaches: 1st. The real presence of Jesus Christ. 2dly. That *transubstantiation* has been effected by the power of Jesus Christ, and the substance of the bread and wine changed into the substance of his body and blood.

### *The Real Presence.*

The doctrine that God Incarnate is, from love for men, really, truly, and substantially, present under the humble appearances of the ordinary articles of man's daily food, bread and wine, is so far above the comprehension of reason, that many find it "a hard saying," and ask "how it can be so?" Reason also has refused to admit the mystery of the Trinity, and the affecting mystery of the Incarnation, and many other mysteries, but not wisely, because God, to whom all that he wills

---

\* John xiii: 26, &c. Math. xxvi: 26. Mark xiv: 22. Luke xxii: 19. † 1 Cor. xi: 24. ‡ Luke xxii: 19.

to do is possible, has revealed these mysteries. Men by various interpretations, have tried to show that God never intended to give himself in the present life, sacramentally, to those to whom he promises to give himself eternally in heaven. They imagine the bread and wine to be a mere figure of the body and blood of Christ, and feign a manducation or eating of the body by faith, rather than admit so much power and love in God, or accept such a great gift from his goodness. He who came to fulfill ancient figures by the *reality*, which was prefigured so splendidly in the rock of the desert, the manna which fell from Heaven, and the Paschal Lamb, by their contracted hearts and views, is, at the last moment of his exercise of love and power before his death, to be prevented, when making his last will and testament, from giving more to his friends and disciples than a similar and still more ancient figure, the bread and wine, such as Melchisedech offered in the presence of Abraham, because what he wills to give is himself, and they do not think he can possibly be able to give himself, really, truly, and substantially.

The church understands better the omnipotence and intentions of her divine founder. She teaches, that, in this sacrament, his body, blood, soul and divinity are "*truly*" present, and that the sensible sign is not a mere figure, such as the Jews had; she teaches, that they are "*really*" present; and not merely represented to be there by the *faith* of the Christian; and she declares, that they are "*substantially*" present; not merely present by a virtue or force acting on the soul of the receiver, while themselves are absent in heaven, but *present* as *substances* are present under their properties.

However wonderful this mystery may appear, there is no article of the Catholic creed more clearly announced and presented in the Scriptures; and none, that, in all ages, has exerted such wonderful influence, and produced such wonderful effects in the lives of men, as manifested by the history of the church.

The proofs, from the chapter of the promise, or the sixth chapter of St. John, can only be craded by a de-

nial that St. John there speaks of the Eucharist. If there he does not speak of the Eucharist, so important an institution of his divine master, he says nothing about it any where. From the earliest period of the church, this chapter of St. John has been understood to record the promise of Jesus Christ to institute the Eucharist. The Jews had asked the Saviour, 28: "What shall we do that we may work the works of God?" Jesus answered them, 29: "believe in him whom he hath sent." 30. "They said therefore to him: what sign therefore dost thou show that we may see and believe thee? what dost thou work? 31. "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert as it is written: *he gave them bread from heaven to eat.*"

32. "Then Jesus said to them: Amen, Amen, I say unto you: Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. 33. "For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world."

35. "I am the bread of life," &c. . . . 38. "because I came down from heaven." The Jews murmured because he said, 41. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven," and asked, 42. "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how then sayeth he, I came down from heaven?" Jesus said: 48. "I am the bread of life." 49. "Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead." 50. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die." 51. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." 52. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever, and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world."

53. "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" 54. Then Jesus said to them; Amen, Amen, I say unto you; except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." 55. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up in the last day."



56. "For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed."

It is clear in the above passage, that our Saviour speaks at first of a bread which has already been sent to men from heaven, and declares that he is that living bread which came down from heaven to give life to those believing in him; and again he speaks of a bread that has not yet been given, but which is to be given to men in the future, and he makes a promise to give this bread, and says: "the bread which I *will give is my flesh*, for the life of the world." He first declares himself "the living bread," and then declares that he will, at some future time, "give bread," which shall be his "flesh" for the life of the world. God had already furnished him with the *seal* of his authority, in the miracle of the multiplication of the five loaves, to feed five thousand people; "For him hath God, the Father, sealed." And having this seal, he wishes to give a meat that "endureth unto life everlasting." But to have the benefit, men must be satisfied with *the seal*, and "believe in him," that he is able to give this super-excellent meat. He, being himself the living bread, will give bread, but bread which will not be bread as to *substance*, but be himself, his "flesh for the life of the world."

How did his hearers understand what he said? They understood that he spoke of their eating his flesh, for they asked: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" He did not deny that he meant a real eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, but in stronger terms asserted the necessity that men should thus eat his flesh and drink his blood, if they wished eternal life.

To make his words true, he must then, in a manner known to himself, present himself as bread, that when he gives this bread, those who eat it may, as he expresses it, "eat him." "So he that *cateth me*, the same shall live by me." He must give bread, which, while appearing to be bread, shall be *indeed* his flesh and blood. He has declared that "unless you eat the flesh

of the son of man, and drink his blood you shall not have life in you." And he therefore commits himself, as man's Redeemer and Saviour, to the necessity of rendering it possible for man to eat his flesh and drink his blood. Man has not the difficult and impossible obligation of devising *how this can be done*; but he, who requires it being God, will himself render it possible, and appoint the way. He says, this way does *not yet exist*, for he speaks in the sense of the future, and, therefore, it is not merely *by faith* in his incarnation, or belief that "he is the living bread which came down from heaven," as some pretend, for this belief already existed with some of his hearers and followers, and yet with respect to the participation of his flesh and blood, he looks to a future time, saying: "The bread which I will give is my flesh." They are able to believe in him, and believe his incarnation, just then while he is speaking, but they cannot yet eat the bread which he promised to give in the future, and which in eating, they shall eat "his flesh as meat indeed," and drink "his blood as drink indeed." But many of his disciples and followers, hearing this discourse, said: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" &c.

If the doctrine of the real presence be what Jesus Christ intended to convey, it is "a hard saying" to any one who wishes to understand every thing which he is required to believe; but in what sense can it be "a hard saying" under the interpretation of a mere figurative presence? These disciples, finding it hard and difficult, were "scandalized," or stumbled and fell, unable to accept it. The Saviour asks: "Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life." In asking this question, he showed his divinity by *reading their hearts*, for he "*knew in himself* that his disciples murmured at this." He appealed to his ascension, as a wonderful event, connected with this doctrine, and one calculated either to increase or diminish the difficulty

and scandal. As if he said: If you see me ascend to heaven, will you not believe that I descended from heaven, and have therefore power to give you bread which shall be my flesh? If you see me ascend to heaven and know my body has become celestial and spiritual, will you not believe it can be really given to you as if it were bread, and appearing to your senses to be bread? Or if you have such difficulty, when you see my body here present, to believe that I can give you bread that is truly, really and substantially my body, what greater scandal will you take, and what greater difficulty will you have, if required to believe that, when I have ascended up to where I was before, I will still here on earth give bread, "which is my flesh" to be eaten by men? Why doth this scandalize? "It is the spirit that quickeneth the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not." You hear my words according to the flesh, and not according to the spirit. You imagine that my flesh is to be distributed as meat in the shambles, but will not understand that I speak to you of mysteries the most high and spiritual, of a sacrament in which the principal gift is hidden, but which you will not accept, because you will not believe. It would profit nothing to give my flesh to be eaten, exhibited as flesh, divided as flesh; but to give it in the manner I propose, in a sacrament, is to give spirit and life; men shall really, truly, substantially eat my flesh and drink my blood, but not presented under appearances proper to flesh and blood, but under the appearances of bread and wine. My flesh as offered in sacrifice, on the cross, redeems men, and profits every thing to them; my flesh as "meat indeed," profits every thing to you, for I tell you unless you eat it "you shall not have life in you." But your reason, which has become carnalized, and cannot rise to accept spiritual things; which judges things impossible because it does not comprehend them, and which hears my words as if I were but "the son of Joseph," will stumble at my

doctrine, and say it is a "hard saying, and who can hear it."

That his words concerning "spirit and life" did not remove their difficulty to accept his doctrine, is plain from their leaving him after he said this, and therefore it is plain, that he in no-wise gave them to think that he spoke of a mere figure, a mere conventional memorial, an agreement that on certain occasions in eating bread and drinking wine, they should think of his flesh and blood. By no means. The great difficulty of the *real presence* confronted their pride and blindness of reason. Jesus Christ asserted that he would give his flesh as meat *indeed*, and his blood as drink *indeed*, and 67. "After this many of his disciples went back; and walked no more with him."

68. "Then Jesus said to the twelve: will you also go away?" 69. "And Simon Peter answered him: Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal life."

This departure of disciples was caused evidently by the difficulty of believing and accepting his doctrine. And the Saviour knew that their difficulty did not arise from a misunderstanding of his words, but from an unwillingness to believe him to be God made man, and, on his veracity, to accept this wonderful mystery of his love for mankind; the real presence. Had they misunderstood him, he could easily have removed their mistake, and his goodness would prompt him to do this. But apart from their gross conception as to the manner in which his flesh would be given to them, they understood that he literally required, as a condition of spiritual life, that they should eat his body and drink his blood. This he said distinctly, and even asseverated most solemnly. They would not admit him to be more than the son of Joseph, and would not believe his words, and therefore left him. And on what terms did the Apostles remain with Christ? On the only terms in which salvation is possible for men. They accepted the mystery on the word of Jesus Christ, because they believed him and knew him to be the Christ the Son of



God. "Thou hast the words of eternal life." Thy word for us is enough. "We have believed and have known that thou art the Christ the Son of God."

Besides the express promise of Jesus Christ to give himself as food, the proof of the real presence from the words which he used when instituting this sacrament, is of itself conclusive. The words of Christ, understood in their proper and natural sense, declare his real presence in the sacrament. Three of the Evangelists, and St. Paul, state these words: "Take ye and eat; This is my body—Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." Math. xxvi: 26—28. "Take ye: This is my body. This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many." Mark xiv: 22—24. "This is my body which is given for you—This is the Chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." Luke xxii: 19; 20. "Take ye and eat, this is my body which shall be delivered (broken or sacrificed) for you. This cup is the New Testament in my blood." 1 Cor. xi: 24, 25. These are the plain words of the institution. If they are to be understood in their proper and literal sense, they prove the dogma of the real presence. To give a figurative sense to the clear words of Scripture, and reject their proper and natural meaning, cannot lawfully be done, without some other grave and sufficient reason than the difficulty and mystery of the doctrine. The sense, in which the Apostles and the church understood these words and the doctrine established in christendom, is their *true meaning*, and the one intended by Jesus Christ. But the Apostles declared it necessary to "discern" in this sacrament the body of Christ as present; they announced the chalice when blessed as "the communion of the blood of Christ," and the bread as "the partaking of the body of the Lord." 1 Cor. x: 16, and xi: 29. The church and all Christians, except the *followers* of the reformation, have through all ages understood these words literally, and believed the doctrine of the real presence. Berengarius, in the

eleventh century, first conceived the empty notion of a figurative presence, which places this sacrament in the category with the sacraments of the Mosaic dispensation, and banishes Jesus Christ from his sanctuary. The Saviour knew that the Catholic doctrine would be the faith which his church would establish over the whole earth, giving men to fondly believe that their God would condescend to dwell in their midst, and, like the vine nourishing its branches, would make them live of his very substance. The human mind never could have risen to imagine such a doctrine, or have presumed to hope for such a blessing, had the Saviour not taught it and taken measures to accomplish it. If it were an error, an illusion, he could, and should, as the light of the world and the Saviour of mankind, have prevented his words from being so understood, and so cherished, by his church. He did not. Therefore, he wishes mankind to believe this mystery of his real presence in the Eucharist.

Moreover, he calls this institution his "testament in his blood." He gives it on the eve of his death, and in it gives to his church all that is to enrich her and her children for time and eternity. It is not a last will, leaving the mere plot or figure of the testator's estate, but it bequeathes the reality, the estate and inheritance itself. "The Lord is my portion and inheritance," writes the Royal Prophet.

### *Transubstantiation.*

The doctrine of the church is, that "the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ are present *under the forms and appearances of bread and wine.*" It teaches therefore that only the accidents of bread and wine are in the sacrament, and that their substance has been changed or *transubstantiated*. Hence transubstantiation is a substantial portion of the doctrine. In fact, the words of Christ, "this is my body, this is my blood," cannot be *true literally*, unless transubstantiation be understood to have taken place.

You must suppose the body of Christ present by impanation, by *consubstantiation*, or by transubstantiation. The first two modes are inconsistent with the truth of the propositions: "This is my body," "this is my blood." Impanation supposes such a union between the body of Christ and bread, as between the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, that is, a hypostatic or personal union; Jesus Christ becoming bread as the Word of God became *incarnate*; which was an absurd notion invented by Oseander, but denounced by the other reformers.

*Consubstantiation* equally conflicts with the truth of the words of our Saviour, who says simply: "this," and not "in this," or "with this;" and his words could not be true in their simple signification, if, what he demonstrated by the pronoun "this," was not limited to what he declared at the termination of the proposition. Besides, *consubstantiation* would present the extraordinary condition of two substances contained under properties peculiar to only one of them, without any authority in the words of Jesus Christ to justify the admission of such a doctrine. To say that a thing is another, different from what it appears, is to announce a *change*, especially when that thing is not by nature suited to contain the other. A thing suited to contain another, and used for that purpose, may be demonstrated as that other; thus a man may show a purse and say "this is gold," because the purse is designed to contain money, but never can he demonstrate what is not by nature suited to contain something else, and say: "this is that other thing," without, at the same time, by the very force of the language announcing a *change*. But bread is not by nature, nor by any agreement among men, conceived fitted to contain the body of Christ, and his showing it with the simple speech: "Take, eat, this is my body," shows a change of substance, if his speech be true in its whole meaning. If he meant not this, he was bound to manifest his real meaning by an explanation, since the usages of men could not explain his calling bread his body, as the like

was never heard or thought of among men. And it is to be remembered the speaker was God as well as man, and that he was on the eve of his death, and moreover he was establishing a great institution or sacrament for all mankind of all ages of the world, and he had the power to make his words *literally true*, which they could be only in the case that he by his power *changed* the substance, by the operative virtue of his words, and therefore *consubstantiation* cannot be maintained. Hence, most commonly, it is admitted, that if you do not regard the presence of Jesus Christ as merely figurative, but consider it true, real, and substantial, it is necessary from the very force of these words, to receive the doctrine of transubstantiation.

The doctrine of Faith is clear as to transubstantiation. "I believe and profess that, in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic church calls transubstantiation." — *Creed of Pius IV.*

"If any one saith, that in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be anathema." — *Counc. Trent, Sess. XIII, Can. 2d.*

"And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly his own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the church of God, and this holy synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conver-



sion is, by the holy Catholic church, suitably and properly called transubstantiation."—*Ibid*, ch. 3, on *Transubstantiation*.

These show precisely what is of faith, as to this wonderful change, of which its author, in his first miracle at Cana of Gallilee, when he converted water into wine, when "his hour had not yet come," gave assurance by his exercise of omnipotence, for at the eve of his death, and when about to consummate his great work *his hour had come*, and he exerts his omnipotence in effecting this stupendous conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of his body and blood. It is not of faith, that the substance of the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, in the same way as these substances are transubstantiated into our bodies when we eat them as food. Nor is it of faith, that in any of the transubstantiations which take place in nature, we can find something that is just like to this miraculous conversion, for this is a conversion to which no other can properly be assimilated. To say that God, by the general laws of nature, effects different transubstantiations, which He is able to effect without the intervention of secondary causes, may assist the mind to accept this doctrine of transubstantiation, but does not aid it to comprehend the mystery itself, which is an object of faith. The mystery of Christ's real presence being assented to by faith and believed, the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be a difficulty to the mind, as this doctrine seems but to require in addition a belief, that by an exercise of God's power, the substance of the bread and wine cease to be there present under their properties. This cessation is caused by a conversion not comprehensible to us, but possible to God, who created things and their properties, and holds supreme dominion over both, and who can by his omnipotence, do as he pleases either with the substance or the accidents of the things which He has created. We are not required to understand, but to believe this conversion.

"The accidents, at least primarily, indicate the proper

substance as long as it is there, but not another substance, and thus showing some body in which God in fact is, no one can truly announce; *this is God*; and if an angel were in some thing or body, no one showing that body could truly and properly say: *this is an angel*; but to speak truly, he ought to say: *here is an angel*, that is in this place, in this body. Since the demonstrative pronoun *this*, directed to accidents which are perceived, does not demonstrate these accidents but the substance under them, and this substance properly is not only primarily, but alone demonstrated; it follows that the proper substance being present, another cannot be demonstrated. But on the contrary, if the proper substance be not under its own accidents, but another substance be there, that other is rightly, and even necessarily demonstrated. When therefore Jesus Christ, after he took bread, truly declares, that what he offered under those species, is his body; and having received the chalice with wine, that what he offered to them under those species, is his blood, he could not truly predicate these words of the substance itself of the bread and wine, as is plain, nor of his natural body and blood, if they were to remain together with the substance of the bread and wine under the proper species of these latter substances, as is proved above, and it must necessarily be, that the substance of the bread and wine ceases to be there, and the sole substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ remains under those accidents or appearances. In a word, to the real presence of Jesus Christ transubstantiation adds nothing but the departure or absence of the substance of the bread and wine in virtue of the signification of the words, or that the words of Christ may be true, and by the name, transubstantiation, this is what may be understood."\* How any one can admit the doctrine of the real presence, and hesitate to receive that of transubstantiation seems strange, since to receive the words of Jesus Christ as literally true, it is necessary to ad-

---

\* Vasquez Dis, p. 180. Cap. 4.

mit that, in becoming present in the sacrament, and announcing himself as there present, his words do not allow the idea that the substance of the bread and wine continues still to remain.

*Other Points in the Doctrine.*

The doctrine of Faith also is, that in this sacrament of the Eucharist each species, that of the bread and that of the wine, or each separated part of these, contains Jesus Christ whole and entire. As St. Paul says: "Whoever eateth this bread *or* drinketh this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body *and* the blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. xi: 27. Therefore to receive under either species unworthily, is to profane the whole; to receive worthily under either, is to receive the whole. "Christ having risen from the dead dieth now no more," he is living, glorious, and cannot be divided. The veil that conceals him, the sensible sign may be divided, but not Jesus Christ himself. His death is mystically shown in the separate consecration of the bread and wine, and he instituted the Eucharist under both the forms as it is a sacrifice to memorialize his passion and death, but his presence is the same under either as under both. Hence the lawfulness for the church to give communion under either form or kind, if she establishes it as her discipline, and hence the fact that it is now the discipline of the church to give communion to the people only under the form of bread. "He that eateth this bread shall live forever." John vi: 59.

It is also of faith that Jesus Christ is present in this sacrament in a permanent manner, and as long as the species remain in their natural condition. As the council of Trent declares "The rest of the sacraments then first have the virtue of sanctifying when any one receives them; but the author of sanctity is himself in the Eucharist before it is used; for the Apostles had not as yet received the Eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when he himself truly affirmed what he was giv-

ing them, to be his body."\* Before the Apostles eat, Jesus Christ says "this is my body," and, in St. Matthew, speaking of their drinking, he uses the word *for*, as if he were furnishing the reason why they should drink, "Drink ye all of this, *For* this is my blood." It is because it is his blood that they should all drink of it. He is then in the sacrament before its reception, and independently of the receiver, and therefore he is there in a permanent manner.

It is of faith, that Jesus Christ, present in the Eucharist, is to be adored there with supreme worship called *latría*, or with such worship as cannot, without sin, be given to any one but God. The church, holding the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, and teaching the real, true, and substantial presence of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist, must necessarily hold, that Jesus Christ is there to be adored, and to be therein exposed for the veneration and adoration of Christians.

As the Catholic believes that only Jesus Christ is present under the accidental forms and appearances of bread and wine, and that there remains nothing of the substance of bread and wine, his adoration is directed to Jesus Christ only, and cannot be referred to the material substance of bread and wine, which no longer, in his faith, is there at all. With this belief, he cannot then, as unbelievers affect to think, be in any danger of adoring bread and wine. The veil itself, which conceals Jesus Christ, may be venerated and revered, but adoration in its strict sense can only be given to the incarnate God, who is hidden beneath, and, in contemplating the host, the Catholic ever remembers his faith that his God has wonderfully made himself present in this holy sacrament.

#### *Of the Matter and Form of the Eucharist.*

The sacrament of the Eucharist is found in the ex-

---

\* Sess. XIII, c. iii.



ternal sign, or the species, together with the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and hence the whole sacrament may be designated either by naming the species or by naming the body and blood of Jesus Christ.\*

The matter used for this sacrament is two-fold, wheat bread, either leavened or unleavened,\* and the wine, which is the natural juice of the grape. Breads made from other kinds of grain, or wines made from other fruits, not having been selected by Jesus Christ, will not serve as the matter for this sacrament. In the wine, when it is about to be consecrated, from the earliest antiquity, both in the Latin and Greek church, a little water is mixed, 1st, because from tradition it is believed the same was done by Jesus Christ; 2dly, because of the water and blood that flowed from his side on the cross; 3rdly, to symbolize the people, as united with their head, who is Christ; and, 4thly, to signify the union of the two natures in Christ. Yet, if omitted, the sacrament would still exist; the omission, if voluntary, would however be a mortal sin, as stated by the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

Theologians most commonly consider the words used by the Saviour in the institution of this sacrament as its *form*. Like the matter it is twofold. The words: "This is my body," this is my blood," or "this is the chalice of my blood," pertain to the essence of the form. Yet the whole form, as given in the liturgy,

---

\* The Catholic church uses unleavened bread; the Greek leavened. The anecdote about some lady having asked to be allowed to prepare the host, and, in doing so, put poison in it, telling the priest of the fact, only after consecration and before communion, and he being afraid to consume it, is simply absurd to any one who knows the Catholic doctrine. Poison, or other substances, than simple bread of wheat, and natural wine, were not chosen by Christ for this sacrament, and, being wickedly introduced, must have their effect, unless prevented by a miracle, which has not been promised by our Saviour. A priest might well fear the natural effect of poison, when he knew that his faith gave him no authority to believe that God would change it because found in the host consecrated at mass. But what are we to think of the person who would put it into the host, knowing that such host was to be consecrated at the altar of God in the solemn sacrifice of religion.

must be used by ecclesiastical if not apostolical direction, and this form covers all the questions of theologians as to what is, or is not essential.

*Of the Minister of the Eucharist.*

The ministers of this sacrament may be distinguished into those who have the power to make this sacrament, and those who can distribute it. It is of faith, that the dignity of the priesthood is necessary to qualify a person to make this sacrament, or to consecrate the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Hence, only bishops and priests have this power, for such only were present when Jesus Christ said: "do this for a commemoration of me." It has been held at all times in the church as a settled point of faith, though denied by heretics, that bishops and priests only can offer the Eucharistic sacrifice and consecrate the Eucharist. Deacons, have, however, been permitted to distribute the Eucharist, and even lay persons, in time of persecution, to take this holy sacrament with them to their homes, and to partake of it on opportune occasions.

*Of the Subject to Receive the Eucharist.*

The suitable subject for receiving this sacrament is a baptized person, who is in a state of grace. "Let a man prove himself and so let him eat that bread, and drink of the chalice, for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord."\* The church has varied in her discipline about giving this sacrament to infants, or to public sinners, even after repentance. She positively excludes the unbaptized, those who do not profess the true faith, and the excommunicated.

---

\* 1 Cor. xi: 28, 29.

*Of the Necessity of this Sacrament.*

It is certain that the holy Eucharist, as a sacrament, was not instituted to confer the first grace, or for the remission of sins, and the church has decided that it is not absolutely necessary for children before they have attained the age of discretion. These are regenerated by baptism and united to the mystic body of Christ. If it be not absolutely necessary as *a means* for adults, it is morally necessary, by a positive *command*, and a person, for positively disobeying this command, and for not having either actually, or at least in desire, received this sacrament from indifference or indisposition, would be excluded from salvation. Yet as to the time, when those who arrive at sufficient age to be instructed and received to holy communion, are to be admitted, the pastor and confessor must be allowed to judge. Parents ought not to use their authority to keep back their children from the holy communion, as some do, when the pastor thinks them sufficiently prepared, and of a sufficient age to receive this sacrament.

*Of the Effects of the Eucharist.*

The fact that this sacrament contains the fountain, source, and principle of all good, is sufficient to show that its effects are manifold and inestimable. Some of the chief of them are the following: 1st. It causes an *intimate union* of the Christian with Jesus Christ; as St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: Christians are *concorporei et consanguinei Christi*, united in body and blood with Christ. 2dly. It gives *grace* to nourish the soul as food does the body. 3dly. It remits venial sin, and is the remedy of daily spiritual infirmity. 4thly. It preserves those who receive it worthily from future sins. 5thly. It has great virtue in assisting to obtain eternal life; and, finally, it is the pledge of a glorious resurrection and of eternal happiness.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRIFICE—THE MASS—THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION HAS A PUBLIC SACRIFICE—THE BODY OF CHRIST, THE ACCEPTABLE VICTIM OF SACRIFICE, ON THE CROSS AND IN THE EUCHARIST—PROOFS THAT THE MASS IS A TRUE SACRIFICE—OF THE MATTER AND FORM—ITS EFFECTS OR PROPERTIES—ITS MINISTER—OF THE LANGUAGE IN WHICH IT IS OFFERED—TO WHOM, AND FOR WHOM IT IS OFFERED.

In general, sacrifice is an offering which we make to God in token of our dependence and submission. It may be interior, such as faith, charity, prayer, &c., or external, consisting of some exterior thing which we offer to God, as the body offered in martyrdom, or by abstinence or continence. Sacrifice, in its enlarged sense, includes all sorts of good works done for the purpose of giving honor to God, but in its restricted sense, is an offering made to God of some exterior thing immolated in honor of him. Exterior sacrifice may be defined thus: sacrifice is the oblation or offering of some sensible thing made to God by a lawful minister and with a sacred rite, to acknowledge, by the destruction or other change of the thing, the sovereign dominion of God, and our subjection to him, and to render him due homage.

When we consider the history of man from the beginning, we find that external sacrifice constituted the essential act of religion, the principal part, and, as it were, the soul of the worship which men rendered to God. By means of victims immolated, destroyed, or changed upon the altars of religion, men recognized their sinfulness, their dependence, the necessity of expiation, and God's sovereignty and holiness. Under the natural law, as well as under the Mosaic dispensation, there were numerous sacrifices of different kinds. The Old Testament exhibits three sorts—The holo-



caust, the pacific offerings, and the victim for sin. In the first, the whole victim was consumed by fire, to testify the perfect and entire dominion of God, and the entire respect and homage due to his majesty. The peace offering contemplated two ends—1st, to return thanks for benefits received. 2dly, to ask other favours or aids from God. The sacrifices for sin were offered expressly by way of expiation and atonement for sin.

*The Body of Christ the Acceptable Victim.*

These sacrifices derived their value from the fact that they were figures and shadows of the great sacrifice, which the Incarnate son of God was to offer to his eternal Father on the cross, immolating himself as a substitute for the human race, and as the price of their redemption. The sacrifice of the cross was to perfect, accomplish, and abolish all anterior sacrifices. In it, Jesus Christ was both priest and victim; consumed as a *holocaust* by the fire of his charity; a *peace offering* by way of infinite thanksgiving for all benefits, and of impetration for all graces and favours to be dispensed to men; a sacrifice of *expiation* and *propitiation* for the remission of all the sins of all mankind. In abolishing the shadows and figures of the ancient sacrifices, he introduced the truth and reality, by his own eternal priesthood, and by means of “the body which had been fitted to him,” for this purpose, when he said, “behold I come.”\*

“Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not; but a body thou has fitted to me:” “Therefore,” says St. Augustine, “thou didst not desire sacrifice and oblation. What then? Have we been left, *in this time*, without a sacrifice? Far from it. For thou hast fitted to me a body, therefore thou wouldst not have those (sacrifices,) that thou mightest perfect this. Thou didst will those before thou hadst this.”†

\* Heb. x: 5-7.

† St. Aug. on Ps. xxxix.

*The Mass—The Christian Religion has a Public Sacrifice.*

The body of Christ was to be the means, for the oblation of sacrifice, after the abolition of the figurative sacrifices of the ancient law. Jesus Christ immolated himself on the cross, by a bloody sacrifice, and dying once for all, for the remission of the sins of all, atoned for all sins superabundantly, and this sacrifice is *the only absolute, perfect sacrifice*, to which every other must be referred; and the victim being of an infinite value needed only thus to *be offered once in death*. The sacrifice of the cross is then the only sacrifice that *merited redemption*. But “*in this time*” are we left without a sacrifice?” “Far from it.” Because the same sacrifice of the cross is represented and commemorated in a true sacrifice; the same high priest, Jesus Christ, continues to fulfill his eternal priesthood, by offering the same body, in an unbloody manner upon the altar of his religion, and by the hands of his chosen ministers who are the dispensers of his mysteries. Religion, in the gospel dispensation, shall still possess its *essential act*, and external sacrifice shall still manifest God’s sovereignty and man’s dependence, and, through the lapse of ages, Calvary and its bloody scene shall, “from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof,” in reality as to the victim and the high priest, but *in an unbloody and mystic manner*, be perpetually kept before the view of God and men, for the honor and glory of God, and for the salvation of men. This memorial sacrifice of the new law is termed the Mass. As to its essence, it is the same sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which was offered once for all, but, by reason of *the manner* it is different. As far as it is the same, it is a renewed offering by Jesus Christ of himself to his Father, but he offers himself in a manner, no longer intended as *paying the price of redemption*, which has been already paid and accepted, but for perpetuating the remembrance of it, and applying *its salutary virtue for the*

remission of sins, daily committed by men. Its virtue is derived from the sacrifice of the cross. But it is in the full and strict sense of the word, a sacrifice. There is a real victim, really and truly offered, by a legitimate minister and by a sacred rite, to thank God for his benefits, to ask favors and graces from him, to render him propitious, to satisfy for sins, and to express his sovereignty and our dependence. This doctrine is thus stated by the Council of Trent, "He, therefore, our God and Lord, though he was about to offer himself once on the altar of the cross unto God, the Father, *by means of his death,*" there to operate "*an eternal redemption;*" nevertheless, because that his priesthood was not to be extinguished by his death, in the last supper, on the night in which he was betrayed—that he might leave to his own beloved spouse, the church, a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice, once to be accomplished on the cross, might be represented, and *the memory thereof remain* even unto the end of the world, and its *salutary virtue be applied* to the remission of those sins which we daily commit,—declaring himself constituted "*a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedeck,*" he offered up to God the Father his own body and blood under the species of bread and wine; and, under the symbols of those same things, he delivered (his own body and blood) to be received by his Apostles, whom he then constituted priests of the New Testament; and by those words, *Do this in commemoration of me,* he commanded them and their successors in the priesthood, to offer (them); even as the Catholic church has understood and taught. For having celebrated the ancient Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their going out of Egypt, he instituted the new passover, (to wit,) himself to be immolated, under visible signs, by the church through (the ministry of) priests, in memory of his own passage from this world unto the Father, when by the effusion of his own blood, he redeemed us, and "*delivered us from the power of darkness, and trans-*

lated us into his kingdom." And this is indeed that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness, or malice of those that offer (it); which the Lord foretold by Malachias was to be "*offered in every place, clean to his name, which was to be great among the Gentiles;*" and which the Apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, has not obscurely indicated, when he says, that they who are defiled by "*the participation of the table of devils, cannot be the partakers of the table of the Lord;*" by *the table*, meaning in both places the altar. This, in fine, is that oblation which was prefigured by various types of sacrifices, during the period of nature, and of the law; inasmuch as it comprises all the good things signified by those sacrifices, as being the consummation and perfection of them all.\*

#### *Proofs that the Mass is a True Sacrifice.*

There is no reason why the same thing that is a sacrifice should not be also a sacrament, since, as a sacrifice, it is offered to God, as a sacrament, it is used by men. And, indeed, in the ancient sacrifices, besides what was immolated or sacrificed to God, there was always also some part to be partaken of by the priests, or by the priests and people.

To show that the mass is a true sacrifice, many proofs may be adduced, but as we are rather engaged in stating the doctrines of religion than in proving them, we shall content ourselves with referring only to some of these proofs.

And first, these words of the Prophet Malachy deserve consideration: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." †

---

\* Council Trent, Sess. xxii: c. 1. † Malach. i: 10, 11. †



It is clear here that God speaks of a new sacrifice as contrasted with the old ones, and as incompatible with them; he rejects these last, and finds his glory in the one to which he refers as in the future. He cannot then mean a simple interior sacrifice of any kind, because no interior or spiritual sacrifice is incompatible with the sacrifices of the law, but would rather give value to these, and make them more acceptable to God.

It is also clear, that he speaks of an *external* sacrifice, first, because he contrasts it with the *external sacrifices* of the law, and refers to it as substituted to them and taking their place; and, secondly, this new sacrifice is "to proclaim his name great among the Gentiles," and hence must be visible and external. It is further manifest that he contrasts this new and future sacrifice with the old ones, as to *the places* in which the offering is to be made. For the ancient sacrifices could only be offered in one place, and this shall be offered in every place, from the rising to the setting of the sun. From this, it is evident that he speaks of a sacrifice properly so called, the oblation, by a sacred rite, of some external, sensible thing, since otherwise it could not be a marvel, that interior spiritual sacrifices, such as praise and prayer, might be offered to God *in all places*, for the law only restricted external sacrifices to one place, and one temple, but not prayers and spiritual acts.

Besides, it is evident that God here refers to something that shall show he has the nations, the Gentiles, as his people, and as contributing to his honor by their public worship, just as the sacrifices in the temple at Jerusalem were a mark that he was adored and revered by the Jewish people. This homage and submission of the Gentiles must be a supreme *public homage* to God—an adoration, by the chief and only incommunicable act of religion, which is sacrifice, an act of religion which is due to God, and only to God. It must, consequently, be a recognition and adoration of God by an external public worship. In fact, no other religious acts, whether private or public, can announce

the greatness and glory of God as does the act of a public sacrifice, and God therefore evidently speaks of such an act of public worship in this prophecy, showing, that as the Jewish sacrifices proclaimed his glory as God amid the Jewish people, being offered only *in the temple*, in the future, his glory should *in every place* be proclaimed among the Gentiles by a public sacrifice, of far superior worth. For this shall be emphatically "a *clean* oblation," and therefore not anything coming merely from man, not merely praise, prayer, good works or a contrite heart, which, like everything of man, bear the stamp of man's imperfections, and cannot be absolutely dignified with the title of "clean" or "pure." But this victim shall be pure and holy; and in the strictest sense "clean."

Now, has this prophecy been fulfilled? And what has fulfilled it, if not the sacrifice of the Eucharist, or the Mass? The Mass is offered every where as a sacrifice, and it contains the adorable victim of Calvary really present, and is therefore, in the most absolute sense, a clean or pure oblation, and announces the glory of God as nothing else can, by representing, as if in death, his only son whose sacrifice on the cross honored the majesty of God equal to what it is, though it is infinite.

Bearing in mind that God desires to be worshipped by men in a public, social manner, as well as privately, and that the Christian religion was established to gather into one church or society all the followers of Jesus Christ, and that this society must have its public act of supreme worship, which is sacrifice, let any one show, if possible, some *act of public worship* which is a true oblation, and which accomplishes this prediction of Malachy. He can point to nothing unless he admits the Eucharist to be a true sacrifice, since, from the days of the Apostles, only the Mass, and nothing else, except that of the cross, has among Christians been designated and dignified with the name of sacrifice, or oblation in its strict and appropriate sense.

A second proof, that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice,

is founded on the declaration of the Psalmist, and of St. Paul, that *Jesus Christ is a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedeck.*”\* The principal office, of a priest, is to offer sacrifice, for, says St. Paul, every priest is “ordained that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices.” Jesus Christ, therefore, cannot be called a priest *forever*, according to the order of Melchisedeck, unless forever he offer sacrifices in the manner in which Melchisedeck sacrificed. But Melchisedeck offered sacrifice in bread and wine. “But Melchisedeck the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him,”† etc. Jesus Christ must have exercised his priesthood, after the order of Melchisedeck, and he did this when he instituted the Holy Eucharist, offering the reality of what was only figured in the bread and wine of Melchisedeck. But his priesthood, in this same order, was to be continued forever, and therefore he must still offer sacrifice, by means of his ministers, and he can be said to do this no where, if not in the mass, and consequently the mass is a true sacrifice. In the Mass, where bread and wine are first brought forth, the order of Melchisedeck is shown, but the priest speaks in the person of Jesus Christ, and as *his vicar* uses *his very words* as spoken by him when he offered the Eucharist, and these divine and omnipotent words are the sword of the sacrifice of the great high priest Jesus Christ, and by the separate consecration of the elements, they present Jesus Christ, *as if slain*, on the altar, and thus does he fulfil his office of eternal sacrificator. Let him, who denies this proof, show how Christ is forever a priest according to the order of Melchisedeck. It would be strange that the Scriptures, and especially St. Paul, should speak of the *priesthood* of Melchisedeck as applied to Christ, and yet Christ should nowhere be found sacrificing according to this order, although his priesthood, in this very order, be represented as *eternal*.

We have then in the prophecy of Malachy, which

\* Ps. cix: 4. Heb. v: 6 and vi: 20. † Gen. xiv: 18.

must be understood of the Eucharist as the Fathers have maintained, and as we have proved, a clear evidence that the mass is a true sacrifice, and, from the nature of the priesthood of Jesus Christ, a further confirmation of this doctrine. Besides, the same is clearly shown from the words of institution, where Jesus Christ says: "*This is my body, which is broken for you;*" "*this is my blood, which is shed for you.*" For this is equivalent to his saying: I present, I offer and sacrifice my body and blood for you, or for the remission of your sins. St. Luke, as shown in the Greek, represents Jesus Christ as saying: "*this is the chalice in my blood, which (chalice) is shed for you,*" and thus Jesus Christ does not simply speak of his blood shed for the salvation of men, but of his blood thus shed in as much as it is contained in the chalice, and as it is offered in the last supper. The participle *shed* agrees in gender with the word chalice or cup, and not with the word blood. The *breaking* of the body and shedding of the blood, as contained in the chalice, is equivalent to immolation, and the present tense is used to show, that in the present action, Christ *offers* his body and blood "*for them,*" besides that he gives the same *to them* to be received in communion. The Apostles were told not merely to receive, or eat the body and drink the blood, but they were told by Jesus Christ to "*do for a commemoration of him,*" what he had done. "*Do this for a commemoration of me.*" As if he said to them, as my priests, do you offer this sacrifice, as you have seen me offer it, and having sacrificed, give to others my body and blood in this sacrament, for I appoint you to represent me in my priesthood, where the appearances of bread and wine, under which I place my body and blood, make my sacrifice similar to that of Melchisedeck, who was a figure of me, as his sacrifice was also a figure of my sacrifice."

Hence, we find St. Paul, not only speaking of "the communion of the blood of Jesus Christ," and of "the participation of his body," but also *contrasting* this great action of the Christian religion with the sacrifices



of the Jews, and the sacrifices of the heathens, and showing that he viewed it as a real sacrifice, just as those also were real sacrifices with which he contrasts it.\* He indeed calls the altars in both cases *tables*, not because he was not aware that the pagans had *real altars*, and that the Christians had a real altar, for he says elsewhere: "*we have an altar, of which they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle,*"† but because he was speaking to the people of their *partaking* of the victims sacrificed, and he directs their attention to this communion especially, and even now, in the church, the place where the communion is given, is called the table. But he keeps in view also, that the victims were *first sacrificed*. Those of the pagans were "*sacrificed to idols,*" that of the Christians "*to God.*"

In the Acts, chapter xiii: 2, this Christian sacrifice is referred to thus: "As they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them," &c., in the Greek, the word for "ministering" is properly rendered "sacrificing," and is the word by which, among the Greeks, the sacrifice of the Mass is expressed.

The ancient liturgies, and the numerous testimonies of Fathers and Councils, and the use in Christian antiquity of the terms altar, priest, oblation, sacrifice, &c. furnish further proofs of this doctrine, that the Mass is a true sacrifice. The agreement with the Catholic church, of the separated Greek church and of other denominations, such as the Nestorians, Eutychians, Armenians, and the numerous oriental sects, upon the subject of the Mass as a sacrifice, is not without great weight, in proving that the belief descends from the days of the Apostles. These churches must have recognized the Mass as a true sacrifice before the period of their separation from the Catholic church, and their esteem for it proves its general reception among Christians in the first ages of Christianity. Had it not been recognized as the essential public act of religious

---

\* 1 Cor. x: 16, 17, &c.      † Heb. xiii: 10.

worship, and as of divine institution, they would necessarily, in their separation, have freed themselves from it, as an innovation, and, had it been instituted after the time of their separation, they never would have adopted it.

*Of the Matter and Form of this Sacrifice.*

Jesus Christ, being really present, can really offer himself in the Eucharist; and though he does not there really die, yet as his death is represented, and he is mystically slain, this mystic death as truly announces God's sovereignty as did his real death on the cross. Jesus Christ, under the appearances of bread and wine, is the victim offered, and is termed the *matter* of the sacrifice;\* the *form*, which produces and consummates the sacrifice is found in the words of consecration, which render the victim present on the altar, and put him in the state of death, by the mystic separation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The words of consecration, rendering Jesus Christ truly, really, and substantially present on the altar, and containing a real oblation, constitute the essence of the sacrifice, although the communion, of the priest who offers, belongs to its integrity. The other actions of the celebrant, which precede and follow, are appointed for its proper celebration, and to impress the assistants with an idea of its excellence and dignity.

---

\* The bread and wine are the *matter* to be consecrated, and yet are not the matter offered in sacrifice or the victim offered, since in this sacrifice there is a change or conversion, one thing ceasing to be there present, and another being made present in its place, the substance of the bread and wine being no longer there, and the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ being offered in sacrifice to God, in some sort, as took place in the sacrifice of perfumes, where the fragrant gums were consumed on the altar and the sweet odours which exhaled, were offered to God. See *Exodus xxx.*

*Of the Effects, or the Properties of the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

As the mass only differs in manner of oblation from that of the cross, and is the same sacrifice with it, it must have the same properties. It is a *holocaust* or sacrifice of praise to honor God, and to recognize his sovereign dominion over creatures. It is *Eucharistic*, or a sacrifice of thanksgiving for benefits received. It is *impetratory*, and in it, Jesus Christ, our mediator, intercedes for us, and continually represents to his Father the death which he suffered for his church, and therefore it is the most efficacious means of obtaining from God the graces we need, as well spiritual as temporal. Finally, it is *propitiatory*, because it obtains for us the grace of conversion, the spirit of penance, and the remission of sins, by *applying to us* the price of the sacrifice of the cross. It does not remit sin directly, but it produces this effect by the grace and gift of penance, which we derive from it. Being the same with that of the cross, it is *infinite* in value, but being intended as a memorial of the death of Jesus Christ, and for applying his merits, this application must be made in a finite manner, and in proportion, to the dispositions of those for whom it is offered, and to the designs of the mercy of God with respect to men in general, and each person in particular.

*Of the Minister.*

The chief minister of this sacrifice is Jesus Christ, who is also the victim. But he uses the ministry of his priests, who alone are empowered to act for him in this great action. The character of the priesthood therefore is indispensably necessary for the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice; but any one having this character can *validly* offer it, no matter what may be his moral condition. Only a priest in the state of grace, however, can *licitly*, and with propriety, approach the altar

to offer this sacrifice. It is of faith that private masses,\* in which only the priest receives communion, are lawful, and are a true sacrifice, as stated by the Council of Trent.—*Sess. XXII. Ch. VI.*

*Of the Language in which it is Offered.*

The use of the Latin language in this sacrifice, is at once a proof of the ancient origin of the mass, and of the universality of the church. This language being fixed, is conservative of the integrity of the liturgy; and as the most of the mass consists of prayers to God, and a great part has been, from the earliest times, recited in a low voice by the priest, as directed in the rubrics or rules, the church has thought it convenient to preserve this language, and to enjoin on pastors, and those charged with care of souls, to explain to the people the parts of the mass, and the mysteries connected with it. This being done, and the people having a translation of the ordinary of the mass in their prayer books, it is found that no fair or well grounded objection can be made against the use of the Latin language in the public offices of the church, while great advantages result from it. The fact that the clergy are necessarily compelled to know the Latin language, enables the church to have a common language for her general councils, and the use of this language in her Liturgy, enables the Catholic, no matter from what part of the world he comes, or what his native language, to be equally at home in the temple of his religion, and assisting at the

---

\* Those persons who have not given much attention to the doctrines of the church, and taken pains to inform themselves, imagine there is a great difference between a mass that is only read, and a high mass in which different portions are sung, and a solemn high mass, in which different ministers take part in the ceremonies. For such we state, that the mass is entirely the same, except that portions, such as the Kyrie Eleison, the Gloria, Creed, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, and responses are sung by the choir, and the Collects, Post Communions, Salutations, Epistle, Gospel, and Preface by the priest. There are more ministers and assistants when a bishop sings mass.



holy sacrifice, in any part of the world. The Catholic who takes pains to inform himself, is soon able knowingly to follow the priest through all the parts of the service.

*To Whom, and for Whom, it is Offered.*

It is of faith, that sacrifice can only be offered to God, and to Him only is it lawful to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice. But the church, at times, celebrates masses in honor and memory of the saints, not offering the sacrifice to them, "but giving thanks to God for their victories, and imploring their patronage that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth."\*

This sacrifice may be offered for the living and the dead, as is seen in all the ancient liturgies, and as taught by the church. It may be offered for all the living, whether in the church or out of it, but the names of infidels, of the excommunicated, and of heretics, are not publicly recited in the prayers of the church; and the sacrifice is not offered for them by name, though the priest and people may, by the private intention of the mind, pray for them while offering the mass.

As to the dead, according to Catholic doctrine, they are divided into three classes, the blessed, those who are in purgatory, and the damned. It is not proper that the mass should be offered for the saints, and martyrs, nor can it be offered for the reprobated. Only then for souls of deceased persons who may be detained in the middle state of purification, or purgatory, is this sacrifice offered. As St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: "We pray for all those who have gone out of this world in our communion, believing that their souls receive great relief, from the prayers which are made for them, in this holy and dreadful sacrifice, which is on the altar."†

The ceremonies of the Mass, the arrangement of the parts, the vestments of the celebrant, and every thing

---

\* Counc. Trent, Sess. XXII, ch. III. † Serm. CLIX.

pertaining to this great religious action, merit examination. Everything, when explained and rightly understood, is calculated to inspire the Christian with piety, reverence, and devotion, and to enable him, in the most lively manner, to bring before his mind the Passion and Death, the Resurrection and Ascension, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In it God is honored in a manner equal to what he is in himself, since the High Priest and the victim is the same "who thought it not robbery to be equal with God."\* The church knows that her children can do no action so great and so acceptable to God, as devoutly and worthily to unite with their Saviour in the celebration of this dread and holy sacrifice, and therefore she commands all, who have attained the use of reason, under pain of mortal sin, to sanctify the Sundays and Festivals of obligation, by assisting at Mass. If through their own fault, and when not prevented by some grave and serious reason, they absent themselves from mass on Sundays and festivals of obligation, they are guilty of mortal sin, and of neglecting to unite with the church in the public worship of God, and by this neglect they do what is in their power to deprive God of the glory amid the nations, which he derives from this "clean oblation."

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE—CONTRITION—CONFESSION—SATISFACTION—ABSOLUTION—THE MINISTER.

The Council of Trent, Sess. XIV., ch. i, introduces the exposition of the Catholic doctrine with respect to the sacrament of Penance in the following terms: "If such, in all the regenerate, were their gratitude towards

---

\* Philip. ii: 6.

God, as that they constantly preserved the justice received in baptism by His bounty and grace; there would not have been need for another sacrament, besides that of baptism itself, to be instituted for the remission of sins. But because God, *rich in mercy, knows our frame*, he hath bestowed a remedy of life, even on those who may, after baptism, have delivered themselves up to the servitude of sin and the power of the devil—the sacrament, to wit, of Penance, by which the benefit of the death of Christ is applied to those who have fallen after baptism.” In giving to man justification by a new birth in baptism, the Saviour has not conferred on him impeccability. He can lose grace and holiness by sin, and unfortunately his frailty is so great, and his enemies are so powerful and active, in furnishing temptations, that he easily and frequently falls into sins of different degrees of guilt, and needs therefore a remedy for these miseries and misfortunes. As the aim of the Saviour is to rescue men from the servitude of sin and the empire of the devil, in his mercy he has provided a sacrament for the cleansing of the soul from the guilt of sins committed after baptism, and furnishing it anew with grace and sanctity. He has taken as the basis of this sacrament, what during the whole period of man’s history, has been essential for the reconciliation of the sinner to God, I mean, the *virtue of Penance*, or what is usually called repentance, being sorrow of mind for sins committed with a hatred and detestation of them, and not only a purpose to sin no more, but to endeavor to satisfy God for the past transgressions of his commands. To this virtue, he has added a sacred rite, in which his priest or minister, to the sinner who comes with proper dispositions to confess his sins, imparts, in express terms, the grace of absolution or forgiveness. He has thus pledged himself, by means of this sacred sign, from the very work done, *ex opere operato*, to pardon the sinner the guilt of his sins and eternal punishment due to them, and to reconcile himself to him. That which before was not a sacrament, is by him made a sacrament, in behalf of all baptized persons who

have incurred the guilt of sin. And “the Lord then principally instituted the sacrament of Penance, when being raised from the dead, He breathed upon His disciples saying: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.*” \* By which action so signal, and words so clear, the consent of all the Fathers has ever understood that the power of *forgiving and retaining sins* was communicated to the Apostles and their lawful successors, for the reconciling of the faithful who have fallen after baptism.” †

It is of faith, that Penance is a sacrament of the New Law, different from that of Baptism, and appointed by Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism. Besides the exercise of the power given by Jesus Christ to his ministers, there are, necessarily, required certain acts on the part of the sinner, who seeks from God the pardon of his sins.

In this sacrament, as in the others, are found the *matter* and the *form*. Theologians make a distinction as regards the matter, into *remote* and *proximate*. They consider the sins as the *remote* matter, and *the acts* of the repentant sinner, in seeking forgiveness, as the *proximate* matter. The church has declared that from the penitent sinner, in order to obtain entire and perfect remission of his sins, there are required three acts, as the *quasi matter* of the sacrament of penance, viz: contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of penance. By the use of the word *quasi matter*, as explained by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, it is not meant that these three acts are not the real matter, but that they are not an external matter, like the water in baptism, or the chrism, in confirmation. These three acts are the necessary matter of the sacrament.

The *form* consists of the words of absolution used by the priest, of which the essence is: “*I absolve thee from thy sins,*” or “*I absolve thee.*” These words are

---

\* John xx: 23. † Counc. Trent, Sess. XIV, c. 1.



pronounced by the priest as holding the place of Jesus Christ, and as the organ of his power. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."\* There are then four things required for this sacrament.

1st. That whoever has sinned after baptism, should be truly sorry and contrite for all his sins.

2dly. That he should confess them to an approved priest.

3dly. That he should be willing to make satisfaction for the expiation of them.

4thly. That he should receive forgiveness or absolution from the priest, to whom he has confessed them.

### *Of Contrition.*

Contrition is an interior sorrow for our sins and detestation of them, with the firm purpose to sin no more in the future. The Council of Trent thus speaks of it: "Contrition, which holds the first place amongst the aforesaid acts of the penitent, is a sorrow of mind, and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future. This movement of contrition was at all times necessary for obtaining the pardon of sins; and in one who has fallen after baptism, it then at length prepares for the remission of sins, when it is united with confidence in the divine mercy, and with the desire of performing the other things which are required for rightly receiving this sacrament. Wherefore, the Holy Synod declares, that this contrition contains not only a cessation from sin, and the purpose and the beginning of a new life, but also a hatred of the old, agreeably to that saying: *Cast away from you all your iniquities, wherein you have transgressed, and make to yourselves a new heart and a new spirit.*"†

There are two kinds of contrition, viz: *perfect contrition* and *imperfect* contrition, or attrition. Perfect contrition is that which arises from perfect charity, or a charity which induces the love of God above all things

---

\* John xx: 21. † Council Trent, Sess. xiv: c. iv.

for himself, and because he is infinitely perfect. Imperfect contrition springs from a motive inferior to that of perfect charity, such as from the difformity and turpitude of sin as shown by faith, or from the fear of hell and dread of God's chastisements. Perfect contrition justifies a man of itself, and before the reception of the sacrament of penance, but not without regard to its virtue, since the will or desire to receive this sacrament must be included in it.

Imperfect contrition, called attrition, including the commencement of some love of God, the hope of pardon, and also the intention and will to sin no more, is "a gift of God and an impulsion of the Holy Ghost, and disposes the sinner to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penance." It therefore is sufficient for obtaining forgiveness when found joined to the sacrament. Perfect contrition is a far greater gift of God.

Contrition, whether perfect or imperfect, must have the following qualities. It must be interior, supernatural, universal, and sovereign.

It must be *interior*. It must be a sorrow of the soul; and as sin comes from the heart, detestation of it and regret for having committed it must also spring from the heart. "Now, therefore, saith the Lord: "Be converted to me with all your heart, in fasting, and in weeping, and in mourning; and rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn to the Lord your God."\* Yet as a part of penance, though *interior*, it must in some manner be made sensible, or perceptible, by some exterior signs, that the minister of God may be able to judge that it exists.

It must be *supernatural* in its principle and motives. It is a gift of God. In the order of salvation, we can do nothing without God's grace, and, therefore, we cannot repent for our sins, as we must to be forgiven, without the inspiration and assistance of the Holy Ghost. Our sorrow also must spring from the motives which

---

\*Joel, ch. ii : 12, 13.

faith presents to us. We must detest our sins, because they are offences against God, and displease him. A sorrow, springing from human and temporal motives, such as the temporal evils brought on us by our disorders, or our disgrace before men, would be a mere *natural* sorrow, and of no avail to obtain forgiveness.

It must be *universal*; that is, it must extend to all the mortal sins we have committed, without a single exception. He who cherishes a single mortal sin, or criminal passion, is not repentant. And it is not possible to hate some sins, *because* they are offences against God and displease him, while we love another sin that equally offends and displeases him; for if this motive influences us really, it will make us hate all our offences, without exception. Although it is better that the sinner should regret and detest his sins in detail, and excite himself to sorrow from motives peculiar to each special sin, except they be of a nature wherein even self examination is a danger, yet he may have a sorrow that is *universal*, in detesting *all his sins* by a single act, and from a single motive, which suits all mortal sins.

Lastly, it must be *sovereign*; which signifies that we must regard sin as the greatest of all evils, and be more afflicted and sorry for it than for any other evil or misfortune. We must be disposed to suffer every thing, and make a sacrifice of every thing, rather than offend God by mortal sin. But in sorrow there are degrees, and sorrow may be *sovereign* without being as *intense* in one penitent as it is in another. Hence, it is not required to be *intensely* sovereign, or to exist in the highest possible degree. So also it may be *sovereign* without being as lively and as affecting to sensitiveness, as sorrow which springs from certain temporal evils. Thus, a person might be affected in a more lively and sensible manner by seeing a dear parent die, than in considering that he has offended God by sin, and yet would far prefer to see that parent die, than to commit a mortal sin again. A person might be much more moved and stirred at the prospect of losing the life of

the body, than at the danger of losing by a mortal sin the life of the soul, and yet far prefer to die rather than to commit a mortal sin.

True sorrow for sins committed necessarily includes a purpose or resolution not to sin in future, and this resolution, like the sorrow, ought to be sincere, firm, universal and efficacious. The marks of such a resolution are its effects, such as, 1st. The beginning of a new life. 2d. The correction of evil habits. 3d. The avoiding of the occasions of sin.

As contrition is a gift of God we must solicit it from him by frequent and fervent prayer.

### *Of Confession.*

Confession, as a part of the sacrament of Penance, is an accusation and declaration of sins, made by a penitent to a priest, who has jurisdiction, or is approved for hearing confessions, in order that the priest may indicate the mode of satisfaction and the remedies for sin, and may grant absolution for them.

It is of faith, that sacramental confession of sins is necessary by the law of God.\*

This necessity is indicated by the words of Christ: "Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent me I also send you. When he had said this, he breathed on them; and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."† He had before promised this power in general terms, first to St. Peter: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."‡ Secondly, to all the Apostles: "Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall

---

\* Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, Can. VI. † John xx: 21, 22, 23.  
‡ Math. xvi: 19.



loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."\* These words confer a general power regarding the affairs of salvation, and a special power to forgive and retain sins. By giving this power to those whom he sent as his representatives, the Saviour constituted them judges, who were to keep in view what was due to the majesty and honor of God, and the interests of men, and who therefore must decide, only after *full knowledge* of the case and of the dispositions of those who wished forgiveness. They could only have this knowledge from the self-accusation, or confession of the penitent sinners, who would resort to this tribunal. Therefore, the duty of confession is implied in the concession of the power to judge and to pass sentence. But in conferring this power upon the Apostles and their successors, to be exercised in his church or society, Jesus Christ gave men to understand that, to be forgiven for their sins, they are under an obligation to have recourse to this tribunal, and with proper dispositions to confess their sins as exactly as possible, and thus he has himself rendered confession necessary for all baptized persons who have sinned, since he desires all to be members of his church, and, in his church, to use the sacraments which he instituted for their benefit. He has not indicated any other means, as sacred institutions, for the direct remission of sins, but baptism for the unbaptized, and Penance for the baptized.†. And it would have been useless to institute a sacrament like Penance, whose value and influence is the power to forgive and retain sins, if it were not obligatory on his followers to use it, in the only reasonable manner that they can possibly do so, which is, by a self-accusation and confession of their sins to his minister, to whom he has granted the power to forgive or refuse forgiveness, not arbitrarily, but according to what is due, at the same time, to God's majesty and to man's utility.

---

\* Math. xviii: 18.

† Though the sacrament of Extreme Unction remits sins, it was not *primarily* and *directly* instituted for this end like Baptism and Penance.

Since the power could not be exercised without confession, it can be no good objection to the doctrine, that confession is necessary, to say that there is no express mention in the Scriptures of *sacramental* confession. The Lord's Supper is held to be a *sacrament*, although not called so expressly in the Scriptures. The practice and obligation of confession are clearly seen in the Scriptures, and in certain passages confession is mentioned, where we have a right to infer that the persons made it sacramentally, and with a view to obtain the benefit of the power given by Jesus Christ to his ministers, who expressly designate themselves as "ministers of reconciliation." To St. Paul, at Ephesus, "Many of them that believed came *confessing* and declaring *their deeds*."\* And it is said by St. James the Apostle, in his epistle, "*confess your sins one to another*,"† in a connection which justifies the opinion that he refers to a *sacramental* confession before receiving Extreme Unction, for he says these words, "Confess your sins one to another," after indicating that, for the sick, *the priests of the church should be called* "to pray over the sick and anoint him with oil." Thus having in view the ministry of the priests, and knowing that our Saviour had given them the power to forgive sins, he must necessarily refer to them when he says, "confess your sins one to another," that is to some one among you, from whom you can receive forgiveness, because he has from God the power to forgive. Otherwise, he would be enjoining what might be the occasion of evils, and could not be of importance, as such other, if not a priest, could not impart forgiveness, since he had *not been* sent by Jesus Christ, as "minister of reconciliation." St. John also states that, "if *we confess our sins*, God is *faithful* and *just* to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity."‡ Why are God's *fidelity* and *justice* here brought under view as requiring him to *forgive* because of *confession*, if he has not himself instituted in his church a sacrament, where, by

\* Acts xix: 18.

† St. James v: 16.

‡ John i: 9.

*the very force of what is done*, he has bound himself to grant sanctifying grace and the pardon of sins? To say he is "*faithful and just*," implies an obligation, and therefore something else besides the pardon of mercy. And to place God under the requirements of his faithfulness and justice in this regard, the Apostle indicates confession with its necessary qualities as the means. This Apostle knew that Jesus Christ had given to him, with his fellow Apostles, the power "to forgive and retain sins," and that their sentence would be ratified by God; and as the power to forgive could not be exercised except after confession, he urges upon those for whom he writes to *confess* their sins, not doubting the justice and fidelity of God to grant them the pardon which he has pledged himself to accord.

Moreover, we must keep in mind that the Christian religion was first established among the Jews, who already were aware that, from time immemorial, God had enjoined confession by a legal precept, and that the Scriptures, read to them so frequently, set forth the value and advantages of confession, not only to God, but confession to those whom God appointed as his representatives and priests. He caused Adam and Eve to confess their sin to Himself, which he knew already better than they did. He reproved Cain for refusing to confess his heinous sin, and put his curse upon him. He enacted the following express law, as we read in the book of Numbers: "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: say to the children of Israel: when a man or woman shall have committed any of all the sins that men are wont to commit, and by negligence shall have transgressed the commandments of the Lord, and offended. *They shall confess their sin*, and restore the principal itself, and the fifth part over and above, to him against whom they have sinned. But if there be no one to receive it, they shall give it to the Lord, and it shall be the priest's, besides the ram that is offered for expiation, to be an atoning sacrifice."\* "They

---

\* Numbers v: 6, 7, 8.

shall confess *their sin*, being *any* of all the sins that men are wont to commit," therefore they shall make a particular confession, and not a mere vague or general one of being a sinner. In Leviticus, we find an order from God that the sinner shall "do penance for his sin," and bring victims to the priest, and "the priest shall pray for him and for his sin."\* The confession was to be made to the priest, as appears from the text, and is shown by the testimony of Jewish tradition, and the practice of the people. Hence we see in the gospel of St. Mathew, that when John the Baptist was preaching in the desert of Judea, the people flocked to him, "from Jerusalem and all Judea and all the country about Jordan; and were baptized by him in the Jordan *confessing their sins*."† They did not merely call themselves sinners, but confessed their sins in particular. It was no doubt to the legal command to confess, that the writer of Ecclesiasticus referred when he gave this injunction: "Be not ashamed to confess thy sins."‡ A mere confession of sin to God cannot be meant, for besides that men are not *ashamed* to confess to God, he adds: "but submit not thyself to every man for sin." He had then in view confession *to man*, and feared that shame would prevent what the law commanded, viz: confession to the priest.

When converted to Christianity, we find them "confessing and declaring their deeds,"§ as narrated in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts, and therefore it was not necessary for the Saviour to instruct them particularly about the obligation of confession when instituting a sacrament, in which his power to forgive is delegated to his minister, and, for its proper exercise, confession is indispensably necessary, and which, from being formerly enjoined by a legal precept, now by him is made an essential part of a sacrament.

The objection which men are disposed to raise as to the possession and exercise of such a power by men, say-

---

\* Levit. v: 5, 6. † Math. iii: 5, 6. ‡ Eccl. iv: 31. § Acts xix: 18.



ing: "Who can forgive sins but God?" has been foreseen and refuted by Jesus Christ himself. We see this refutation in the first verses of the ninth chapter of St. Mathew's Gospel, where our Saviour works the miracle of the cure of the palsied man, in order to prove that "the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins," and where the Evangelist declares, that the conviction that God really "*gave such power to men,*" was produced on the minds of those present. The Saviour calls himself "the Son of *Man*" here, and the people glorify God who "*gave such power to men,*" to instruct us, that even mere men, when sent by God and authorized to act for him, can forgive sins. For God is free to exercise his power by his chosen and appointed agent, as well as by himself. He can appoint men to be "ministers of reconciliation."\*

The testimonies of the fathers of every age, and the constant belief and practice of the church, and even of the Greeks and oriental sects, prove that confession of sins is of divine appointment and of Apostolic tradition. Had it not been from the beginning an obligation, the humiliation attending it, and the repugnance which men have to submit to it, would *absolutely* have prevented its after introduction among Christians. And had it been attempted to introduce it, at any period in the history of Christianity, the place of its invention, its inventors, and the account of its reception and progress, would have found their place in history. But we find in every age proofs of its being practiced, and always held to be necessary for the exercise of the power, "to forgive and retain sins," which Christ himself bestowed upon his Apostles, not to honor them, but for *the benefit of his followers*, and, therefore, which he bestowed also on their successors in the same ministry. It is of faith, that "all mortal sins, of which sinners are conscious after a diligent examination of their conscience, must be enumerated in confession, also those most hidden and secret." It is also of faith, that the circum-

---

\* 2 Cor. v: 18.

stances, which *change the species* of the sins, must be manifested. By circumstances which *change the species*, is meant those things which cause the sin to be of a different nature. The reason given by the Council of Trent is, that otherwise, "the sins themselves are neither entirely set forth by the penitents, nor are they known clearly to the judges; and it cannot be that they can estimate rightly the grievousness of the crimes, and impose on the penitents the punishment which ought to be inflicted, on account of them." Theologians, from these reasons, infer also the obligation to manifest the circumstances, which, though not changing the nature, notably increase the grievousness of the sins. It is of faith, that while persons are not bound to confess venial sins, which do not deprive Christians of the grace of God, and they can otherwise obtain forgiveness for them, yet it is *useful*, and *lawful* to confess them, as is the custom of pious persons.

Without this *integrity* as to the number, nature, and aggravating circumstances, or from the wilful concealment but of a single mortal sin, the confession would be null and sacrilegious. But besides *integrity*, the confession should have other qualities, viz: It should be humble, simple, prudent, and secret.

It should be *humble*, not made as a mere narration, but with a sense of humiliation, with a tone and deportment appropriate to a self accusing criminal, who feels ashamed of his misdeeds, and is sorry for them, and prepared to make adequate satisfaction. It ought to be *simple*, declaring the sins as known to the penitent, without diminution or aggravation, without excusing them, or involving them in ambiguities and narrations, that add nothing to the manifestation of conscience.

It ought to be *prudent*, being made according to charity and propriety; as St. Paul tells Christians: "*Let all things be done decently, and according to order.*"\* It should not be made in gross language, or so

---

\* 1 Cor., xiv: 40.

as to manifest, *without necessity*, the sins and guilt of others. Only when the nature and gravity of our own sins cannot otherwise be confessed, are we at liberty to manifest the sins of others.

Finally, it should be *secret*. This can be understood from the words of the Council of Trent, declaring, that though Christ has not forbidden that a person may, under certain circumstances, confess his sins publicly, yet this is not a divine precept, neither would it be very prudent to enjoin it by way of human law, "whereas the *secret sacramental confession*, which was in use from the beginning in holy church, and is still also in use, has always been commended by the most holy and most ancient fathers with a great and unanimous consent."

This manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, is of divine right, and to be observed. It is very clear, that such confession as we have indicated can only be properly made when the sinner has taken due time to *examine* his past conduct, and prayed to God for light and grace. A strict examination of conscience with prayer for assistance from God, and an endeavour to excite oneself to contrition, should always precede the confession of our sins.

In order that penitents may resort to confession with entire confidence, to seek the cure of their spiritual maladies, advice in their doubts and difficulties, and to be raised to newness of life from the death of sin, the priest who receives sacramental confession is, under the strictest penalties, bound to an absolute secrecy. He is not permitted, in any case, or for any reasons however imperative, to reveal any sin, even the slightest, which may be known to him only by the way of confession. This secrecy has been always strictly enjoined by the church, and respected even by temporal governments. Councils threaten the most grave penalties against any priest, who, "by word, sign, or in any other manner," should manifest the sin of a penitent, who had sought the benefit of his ministry. Confession is sacred and safe, under the inviolable seal of perpetual silence.

*Of Satisfaction.*

The third part of the sacrament of Penance is satisfaction. As a part of the sacrament, *satisfaction* is the penance imposed upon the penitent sinner by the priest to whom he has made confession. To satisfy the divine justice, for the injury done to God by sin is indispensably necessary. The duty of satisfying rests even on those who have obtained pardon of their sins in the sacrament of penance, for though the guilt and eternal punishment be remitted by this sacrament, there remains nearly always a temporal punishment to be undergone either by expiatory works in this life, or, in the next world, by the sufferings of purgatory. The penances which the priest imposes have a sacramental value, and are a means of making satisfaction to the divine justice. The power, conferred by Jesus Christ, is both to loose and to bind, and leaves therefore with his ministers the right to impose salutary satisfaction and remedial penances.

The church has decided, 1st, That God does not always remit all the punishment together with the guilt of sin; and that, even after the guilt and eternal punishment have been pardoned, a temporal punishment, in whole or in part, most frequently remains to be undergone, and that, by divine law, satisfaction is necessary. 2dly. That, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, we can, as to the temporal punishment, satisfy the divine justice for our sins, by the works prescribed by the confessor, by those which we impose upon ourselves, and even by the afflictions which God may send us, if we receive these in the spirit of penance.

3dly. That the satisfaction necessary for penitents is something else than the faith whereby they apprehend that Christ has satisfied for them, and that penance is something more than a mere change of life.

4thly. That the power of "the keys," deposited with the priests of the church, is not only a power to loose but also to bind, regard being had to the quality of sins, and



the state of penitents, and that confessors act according to Christ's institution, when they impose punishments on those who confess.

The church teaches, that we do not satisfy by ourselves and of our own merits, but "while we thus, by making satisfaction, suffer for our sins, we are made conformable to Jesus Christ, who satisfied for our sins, *from whom all our sufficiency is*, having also thereby a most sure pledge, that *if we suffer with him, we shall also be glorified with him*. But neither is this satisfaction, so our own, as not to be through Jesus Christ. For we who can do nothing of ourselves, as of ourselves, can do all things, He co-operating, who strengthens us. Thus, man has not wherein to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ: in whom we live; in whom we merit; in whom we satisfy; *bringing forth fruits worthy of penance*, which from him have their efficacy; by him, are offered to the father; and through him, are accepted by the Father."\*

The church maintains, that, however fully Christ has satisfied for us, his merits and satisfaction must *be applied to us*, and among the ways for this application appointed by Christ is the sacrament of Penance, one of the conditions of which is, that we should suffer with Christ and make satisfaction together with him, as far as lies in us, for our own sins. And though it would be easier for the sinner, if Jesus Christ would leave him no satisfaction to make in seeking forgiveness in this sacrament, but make all for him as he did in baptism, yet he has not chosen to do so. He mercifully regenerated him in baptism, made him a *new creature*, forgave him all the debt and the punishment, both eternal and temporal, but the sinner having been ungrateful, and having fallen into sin in spite of the mercy and grace he received in baptism, Jesus Christ makes it a more painful and laborious thing for him to recover grace and reconciliation. He sinned *through ignorance*, before baptism; after baptism, he knowingly violated the

---

\* Council Trent, Sess. xiv: ch. viii.

temple of God, after having received the gift of the Holy Spirit. No one can deny that this greater severity towards the ungrateful and rebellious is perfectly just. And, that God does exact this satisfaction, is proved by examples from the Scriptures. Our first parents obtained pardon for their sin, but both they and their posterity had to expiate it by penances. The Israelites, after going forth from Egypt, often sinned, and often obtained pardon from the Lord, and yet in expiation of their sins, they had to pass forty years in the desert, and were never introduced into the land promised to their fathers. Mary, sister of Moses, sinned by murmuring against Moses. She obtained pardon, but still it was with the penalty of leprosy, and of seven days separation from the people. Moses himself sinned at the rock and the waters of contradiction; he obtained pardon, and yet in punishment of his sin, he was not allowed the honor of introducing the people into the land of promise. David was guilty of grievous sins, and yet, when admonished by the prophet of God, he sued for pardon, and was assured by the prophet that God had pardoned his sins, but he was told that because he had made the enemies of God blaspheme him, the child born to him should surely die, and because he had struck Urias, the Hethite, with the sword, and taken his wife, "the sword shall never depart from his house," and that "the Lord would raise up evil against him out of his own house."\*

Also, when David sinned by numbering the people, he prayed for pardon and obtained it, yet it was on the condition of sustaining the terrors of a three days pestilence, which came as "the sword of the Lord," and destroyed of Israel seventy thousand men. These are examples of satisfaction exacted by God, who sent his chastisement in punishment of sins which He had forgiven. The Scriptures also contain many examples of voluntary satisfactions, such as David's fastings and penances; the history of the penances of the Ninivites,

---

\* 2 Kings xii: 9, 10, 11, 13, 14.

and the declaration of our Saviour that they shall rise up in judgment against us unless, after their example, we also do penance; the penances of King Manassas, and of the Jews of Bethulia. "Be converted," says the prophet Joel, "be converted to me with your whole heart, in fasting, and in weeping and in mourning,"\* &c. "Unless you do penance," says the Saviour, "you shall all likewise perish."†

This necessity of satisfaction is itself a proof of God's mercy because of the advantages resulting from it.

1st. It teaches that sins committed after baptism are more grievous than those of the unbaptized, as they are more severely punished, and thus inspires a horror for sin, by the difficulty of pardon.

2dly. It recalls us from sin, by putting a curb on the impetuosity of our passions, and inducing greater vigilance and caution.

3rdly. It cures the remains of sin, such as spiritual languor, too much attachment to temporal things, and a certain want of relish for virtue and good works.

4thly. It removes vicious habits, by the acts of contrary virtues.

5thly. It averts penalties or afflictions which God may be about to send us.

6thly. It renders us conformed to Jesus Christ suffering and satisfying; it makes the members similar to the head.

7thly. It gives us a pledge, that, after suffering with Christ, we shall be glorified and reign with him.

In the early periods of the church; the penances were prescribed by certain rules, known as penitential canons, and these show the gravity and deformity which, in the estimation of the church, certain sins have, and how rigorous a satisfaction divine justice requires for them. The penances were often to be performed *publicly*, especially where the sins were known to the public. The repenting sinners constituted four classes, viz: *the weeping, the hearers, the prostrate, and the as-*

---

\* Joel iii. 12, † Luke xiii: 5.

*sisters.* The penances were often very severe and to last for a long term of years, and even sometimes for the whole lifetime. In these times, the intention of the church is, that confessors should be guided by the ancient canons in estimating the guilt of sins, and impose penances "such as the Holy Spirit and prudence may suggest as salutary and suitable satisfactions, the quality of the sins and the ability of the penitent, being considered;" and "that they should keep in view, that the satisfaction which they impose, be not only for the preservation of a new life and a medicine of infirmity, but also for the avenging and punishing of past sins."\*

The kind of works that are reckoned satisfactory, may be inferred from the declaration of the Council of Trent: "that so great is the liberality of the divine munificence, that we are able through Jesus Christ to make satisfaction to God the Father, not only by punishments voluntarily undertaken of ourselves for the punishment of sin, or by those imposed at the discretion of the priest according to the measure of our delinquency, but also, which is a very great proof of love, by the temporal scourges inflicted of God, and borne patiently by us."†

The works imposed by the priest as penances, or to be voluntarily assumed for this purpose, may be classed under three heads, viz: prayer; fasting, and alms deeds. As said in Tobias: "Prayer is good with fasting and alms, more than to lay up treasures of gold."‡ St. Thomas reduces all such satisfactory works to these three heads, thus: "Whatever pertains to the affliction of the body, the whole is referred to fasting; and what is done for the profit of the neighbour, the whole has the estimation of alms-giving; and likewise whatever is exhibited in the worship of God, receives the estimation of prayer."§ The restitution of the goods of any person unjustly taken or retained, and the reparation

---

\* Council Trent, Sess. XIV: ch. VIII. † Ibid, ch. IX. ‡ Tob. xii: 8. § St. Thomas 4 Dist. 15 Ques. 1 Art. 4 ad 3 Satisfactio ad 5, Obj.



of injury done him in his property, his interest, or his reputation, is a thing absolutely indispensable, when it is in the power of the penitent; and when it is not actually in his power, he must at least have the will to do this as soon as he has the ability; but this restitution is more properly considered as cessation from sin, rather than satisfaction for sin.

Sacramental penances, enjoined by the priest, have more efficacy and merit than mere voluntary penances, because they form a part of the sacrament; and to neglect their performance is not only a want of proper respect for the sacrament and sinful, but also leaves upon the penitent the necessity of satisfying for his sins to "the last farthing," with more severe works and sufferings.

### *Of Absolution.*

Sacramental absolution is a judicial sentence, by which the priest, as minister of Jesus Christ, forgives the sins of Christians who are truly penitent, and who have, as far as in their power, done what Christ commands to be done, for obtaining the pardon of sins. It is not a mere declaration that God has forgiven, but it is a sentence of judgment, absolving the guilty person by the efficacy of the act, *ex opere operato*. For Jesus Christ did not say, "whose sins you declare forgiven, they are forgiven," but "whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven," &c. The Council of Trent says: "Although the absolution of the priest is the dispensation of another's bounty, yet it is not a bare ministry only, whether of announcing the gospel, or of declaring that sins are forgiven, but is after the manner of a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as a judge."\*

The power given by Jesus Christ was not only to forgive but also to retain sins. Hence, the priest may defer or refuse absolution according as he judges the

---

\* Council Trent, Sess. XIV, Ch. VI.

penitent unprepared or unworthy to receive the pardon of his sins. He is not left to act, in an arbitrary manner, but according to certain rules, which, in the approved rituals of the church or in ecclesiastical statutes, regulate the proper administration of the sacrament of penance. Among these rules, the following prescribe that absolution should be deferred till persons, in certain cases, prove themselves worthy to receive it, by removing that which is an impediment :

1st. Such as sin from a depraved habit, are not to be absolved until they amend their life.

2d. Those who are in the proximate occasion of sin, until they withdraw from it, if this be possible, and especially if it be a thing bad in itself, which constitutes such proximate occasion.

3d. Those who entertain enmity, until they do what is in their power to effect a reconciliation.

4th. Those who have unjustly taken or who unjustly retain the goods of another, until they make restitution as far as in their power.

5th. Those who are ignorant of the elements of faith and of the principal mysteries and precepts of religion, and those who are ignorant of the things necessary for rightly fulfilling the duties of their particular state of life or office, until they have learned these things, and know them.

When absolution is denied, it is the duty of the penitent to remove the impediment as soon as he is able; and when it is deferred, merely that the penitent may prepare himself better, he ought to give his attention to this, and by pious reading, prayer, meditation, and penitential works dispose himself to receive the sentence which will efface his guilt and reconcile him with God.

The reconciliation of the sinner with God is the principal effect of the sacrament of penance, for absolution can confer this benefit on any sinner, no matter how numerous, or how great may be his sins, if he receive it with the required dispositions; and *not only once, but as often* as sinners shall present themselves

with sentiments of contrition, since the words of Jesus Christ are not restricted: "Whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." "But if the wicked," saith the Lord, "do penance for all the sins which he hath committed, and keep all my commandments; and do judgment and justice, living he shall live, and shall not die. I will not remember all the iniquities which he hath done."\* "Say to them: As I live saith the Lord, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way, and live."† This is the assurance of God's mercy even to the greatest sinners, if they are converted and seek forgiveness through the Redeemer and his sacraments, as "he is the propitiation for our sins; and not only for ours, but also for the sins of the whole world."‡ If the Scriptures speak of the sin against the Holy Ghost, as not to be forgiven, or use expressions which seem to favour the opinion of certain heretics, who pretended that some sins are too great for the power of the keys, the church teaches, that the power of the keys extends to all sins whatever that are submitted to it with proper sentiments of contrition, and that those passages of Scripture are to be understood, not as indicating the absolute impossibility of remission, but the extreme difficulty to obtain for such sins the grace of sorrow and pardon, because of the difficulty of bringing such sinners to true repentance. In this sacrament, the reconciliation of the sinner with God is produced by sanctifying grace, and, if he have been already reconciled before, he is purified still more by an increase of grace, through the influence of the sacrament.

*Of the Minister of this Sacrament.*

We have said, that "the confession of our sins must be made to an approved priest." It is of faith, that only those who have been validly ordained ministers of Christ, the bishops and priests of his church, can be

---

\* Ezech. xviii: 21, 22. † Ibid, xxxiii. ‡ 1 John ii: 2.

ministers of this sacrament. The power of Order is indispensably necessary as defined by the Council of Trent,\* and always believed in the church, and taught by the Fathers and councils. And this is clear also from the words of Jesus Christ.

But something more than the power of Order is necessary to exercise the high office of minister of the sacrament of penance. It is necessary to have also jurisdiction, or to have an approbation and powers from the proper ecclesiastical authority. The Council of Trent says: "Wherefore since the nature and order of a judgment require this, that sentence be passed only on those subject (to that judicature) it has ever been firmly held in the church of God, and this Synod ratifies it as a thing most true, that the absolution which a priest pronounces upon one over whom he has not either an ordinary or a delegated *jurisdiction* ought to be of *no weight whatever*."† The absolution of a priest, not approved or authorized by the lawful superior, by the Pope or by the ordinary of the diocese, to hear confessions and administer this sacrament, is null and void. Therefore, such approbation can be given in terms which limit it as to the duration of time, the place, and the persons. And it is also a doctrine of faith, that, for the discipline of the Christian people, the sovereign pontiff as regards the whole church, and the bishops in their diocese, have the power to *reserve* certain more atrocious and more heinous crimes, and especially crimes to which the censure of excommunication is annexed, which cannot be absolved except by themselves, or by those who have received a special permission or power to grant such absolution. "And it is consonant to the divine authority, that this reservation of cases have effect, not merely in *external* polity, but also in God's sight."‡ But as the church orders this unto edification and not unto destruction, she gives jurisdiction to all lawfully ordained priests for

---

\* Council of Trent, Sess. XIV., Ch. VI, and Can. X. † Ibid., ch. VII.

‡ Ibid.



persons found *in extremis*, or at the point of death; therefore the Council says: "Nevertheless, for fear lest any may perish on this account, it has always been very piously observed in the said church of God, that there be no reservation at the point of death, and that therefore all priests may absolve all penitents whatsoever from every kind of sin and censures whatever."\* Also, to priests, approved for hearing confessions, general powers over all reserved cases are given in time of a general jubilee, except in case of a person affected by a censure for injustice to a third party, and publicly denounced, until he has satisfied the exactions of justice.

The sacrament of penance can only be administered to those who have received baptism, since the church only claims jurisdiction over such as have entered into her membership through the door of baptism. But all baptized persons, able to contract the guilt of sin, can receive this sacrament, and even if they have only to accuse themselves of venial sins, they can partake of the benefit of this sacrament, since venial sins may be usefully subjected to the power of the keys. The necessity of this sacrament for baptized sinners in order to recover God's friendship, by the pardon of their sins is so great, that, with baptism, it ranks as a *necessary means* of salvation. It has been instituted for conferring the first sanctifying grace which effaces mortal sins from the soul. Yet when there is an impossibility to receive it actually, as God does not demand impossibilities, the church teaches that a desire to receive it suffices, if the person with God's grace excites himself to perfect contrition. Sufficient grace is not refused to him who does the best in his power, and who solicits it. *Perfect* contrition, which, of itself, because of its proceeding from the love of God above all things for himself as infinitely good and perfect, reconciles the sinner to God even before absolution, nevertheless includes the desire of receiving this sacrament, for whoever loves God will be prepared, if

---

\* Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, Ch. VII.

in his power, to do the will of God manifested by his leaving with his church the power to forgive and to retain sins, and therefore he will have the desire to submit himself to the tribunal of penance.

---

## CHAPTER XX.

### OF INDULGENCES.

It is proper to present the doctrine of the church on the subject of Indulgences, by way of appendix to the exposition of the sacrament of Penance, because the church grants them in virtue of the plenary power of the keys: "Whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" and because they concern the *temporal* punishment which God often requires from the sinner, after he has, by the sacrament of Penance, cancelled the guilt of his sins and the punishment of eternal damnation. Besides, those who are investigating the doctrines of faith, having considered the nature of the sacrament of Penance, its constituent parts, its absolute necessity for the sinner, when possible, must readily perceive how calumnious it is, to accuse the church of furnishing a license to sin by granting indulgences, as if indulgences were the remitting and the permitting of offences against God.

An indulgence is not a remission of sin, and much less a permission to sin, but it is a merciful relaxation or remission, (by *applying the superabundant satisfaction of Jesus Christ*) of the *temporal punishment* which remains due for sins, after the sins themselves and the eternal damnation due to mortal sin, have been remitted by the sacrament of Penance, or by perfect contrition with the desire of this sacrament.

The Council of Trent speaks thus: "Whereas the power of conferring indulgences was granted by Christ

to the church and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power, delivered unto her of God, the sacred holy Synod teaches, and enjoins, "that the use of indulgences, for the Christian people most salutary, and approved of by the authority of sacred councils, is to be retained in the church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless; or who deny that there is in the church the power of granting them."\* In express terms, this decree shows two things as of faith: 1st, that indulgences are most salutary to the Christian people. 2dly, that the church has the power to grant them.

The condemnation, by Pope Leo X, of Luther's proposition "*that indulgences have not the power to remit the punishment due to the divine justice for actual sins,*" and again, the condemnation of the same by Pope Pius VI. show that the contradictory is the sentiment of the church, and that indulgences are not merely an exterior remission of the Ecclesiastical penances which were assessed by the penitential canons, but are a remission before God of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice for sins, either partly or entirely, according as the indulgence is partial or plenary. St. Thomas argues that, if indulgences only availed before the external tribunal of the church and not before God, they would cause more harm than utility, by absolving merely from the penances enjoined by the canons, and leaving persons to endure more grievous punishments in purgatory, and declares such an opinion not true, because it is expressly contrary to the privilege given to St. Peter, that "Whatsoever he should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven." He concludes that they avail both before the external tribunal of the church and the judgment of God for the remission of the punishment, enjoined or not, which remained after contrition, confession, and absolution. And he thus clearly and beautifully presents the reasons why they have this power. He says: "The reason is the unity of the

---

\* Counc. Trent, Sess. XXV, Ch. XXI.

mystic body (the church) in which many have done more penances than the measure of their debts exacted, and many also have patiently suffered many unjust tribulations, by which they could expiate a great amount of punishment had such been due to them; these merits are in such abundance that they exceed all the punishment due to those who are now living, and *especially because of the merits of Jesus Christ*, who, although he operates in the sacraments, does not nevertheless confine his efficacy to them, but by his infinity exceeds the efficacy of the sacraments. Now we have before said, that one may satisfy for another. But the saints in whom is found a superabundance of satisfaction, have not done these works determinately for him who has need of remission (otherwise he would obtain it without any indulgence), but they have done them in common for the whole church, as the Apostle says, that "he filled up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in his flesh, *for his body*, which is the church." (Coloss. i: 24.) These merits are then common to the whole church. Now things, which are common to a multitude, are distributed to each of its members according to the will of him who presides over the multitude. Thus, as any one would obtain the remission of punishment if another had satisfied for him, the same thing happens, when the satisfaction of another is apportioned to him by the one who has the power to do so."\*

An indulgence is then an application of the satisfaction of Christ to some member of his mystic body. The satisfaction of Christ is an exhaustless treasury† for the church, because of the infinite value and price of his precious blood. "He died for all," and it is certain that the price of his satisfactions has not been actually *applied to all*, for then it would follow that all men,

---

\* St. Thos. Supplement, 3 ques. xxv. Art. 1. in Concl.

† Pope Clement VI. seems to be the first to call the merits of Christ's passion and the satisfaction of his saints, "the treasury of the church." St. Augustine, on the 61st Psalm, says something similar.



who have lived, must have been saved. Consequently great abundance of the price of his passion and death (if it were not infinite, as it really is) must still remain to be applied, and will always be found in the treasury committed to his body, which is the church. And if the merits and satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin, St. John Baptist, and other saints, be said to be in this treasury, as were St. Paul's, and to form part thereof, it is understood that their merits and satisfactions have their virtue and value from the passion of our Saviour; and it is only as dependent on his merits and being in a certain sense his, that they give increase to this treasury; and consequently it may be truly said that originally and primarily, only the merits of the passion of Jesus Christ constitute the riches of this treasury. From St. Paul's declaration, that for "the body of Christ, which is his church," he, *in his flesh*, or by his satisfactions (receiving their value from Christ's passion,) "makes up what is wanting of Christ's sufferings," it is fair to say that he increased the spiritual treasury of the church. Not that anything can be wanting to the infinite merits of Christ's passion, but because Christ, in constituting himself head of the church as his mystic body, wills that his sufferings should, with the sufferings of the members of his body (being made available from the merits of his passion) constitute one common treasury for the whole church, from which satisfaction may, on due conditions, be apportioned to more needy members.

Though general councils of the church and bishops in their diocess, may grant indulgences, the visible head of Christ's church, the Pope, is the chief dispenser of this treasury, and he can apply it to release men from the temporal punishment which may be due to their sins after these have been forgiven in the sacrament of penance; for the words of Jesus Christ are general: "Whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," and if the power, within the kingdom of God established for the salvation of men, be at all *limited*, the church herself, instructed by Apostolical tradition,

would know and understand such limitation. The punishment is as remissible as the sins; and if Jesus Christ has left with his church the power by means of the sacraments, to dispense his merits for the remission of the sins and the eternal punishment, even in favor of his enemies, with greater reason should we believe that, to the same church, he gave the power to dispense the merits of his passion for the remission of the temporal punishment, in favor of his friends.

This power has been continually claimed and exercised. St. Paul saying that he acted "in the person of Christ," pardoned *the excommunication*, which rested upon the incestuous Corinthian, who had already repented, and been forgiven his sin by the proper authorities of the church of Corinth. "Whom you have pardoned, I also pardon," writes the Apostle. At the request of the Corinthians he removed the temporal punishment as to the exterior tribunal of the church and before God, and thus granted a veritable indulgence. Tertullian\* and St. Cyprian† show how the bishops of the early church were accustomed, at the entreaty of confessors and martyrs, to grant indulgences.

The popes also, as we read in church history, as Leo III., Gregory the Great, Urban II., Innocent III., Paschal I, and many others, exercised this power. It is warranted by the approbation of provincial and general councils, as the first of Nice, that of Ancyra, that of Laodicea, that of Clermont, that of Lateran, the councils of Vienna, of Constance, and of Trent. From the power being general, indulgences may be either partial or plenary, and remit either a portion or the whole of the temporal punishment.

However, as the Pope is dispenser, and not Lord of the treasury of the church, there should always be a just and reasonable cause for the grant of an indulgence. And to profit by an indulgence, it is necessary that a person be in *the state of grace*, and faithfully comply with the conditions that are specified, and per-

---

\* Lib. ad Martyr. † Cyp. Ep. 13, 14, 15, et Serm. ult. de Lapsis.

form the good works that are indicated in the terms of the grant. Besides receiving the sacraments of penance and the Holy Eucharist, the terms commonly require such works as prayer, the visiting of churches, fastings, alms-giving, and the like. Nor is the sinner, by means of indulgences, relieved from the obligation of doing what is in his power to make satisfaction to God, since this is imposed on him by the gospel, saying: "Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance."\* The church intends to aid him and supply his inability, but not to exempt him from the obligation which he has contracted by sin to offer satisfaction to God by works of penance, and he must therefore have the desire of making satisfaction, and continue in the spirit and works of penance. In virtue of *the communion of saints*, and of his connection as member with the mystic body of Christ, and with the divine head, his weakness is strengthened and his heart consoled by the benefit he receives from a communication of the satisfaction offered to God by the whole body, of which he is a member, and especially by its head. He must be conformed to Christ, that he may be glorified with him.

The church also is very careful to guard against possible abuses, and orders the correction of such as may have occurred, recommending that "moderation be observed in the concession of indulgences, and that this holy gift be dispensed to all the faithful, piously, holily, and incorruptly."†

Such is the doctrine of indulgences, which, as far as expressly defined, presents these two points of faith. 1st. That indulgences are salutary to the faithful; 2d. That the church hath power to grant them. And it is the clear and constant teaching of the church that they concern only the remission of temporal punishment, and not of sin; and that they are beneficial to those who receive them because of the law, by which God

\* Luke iii: 8.

† Counc. Trent, Sess. XXV. Decree on Indul-

gences.

has constituted a *communion of holy persons in holy things,*" and made the merits and satisfaction of Christ in union with his mystic body, *reversible* to individual members, for the duty of satisfaction, as, in the sacraments, he has made the application of the merits of Christ and of his divine and sanctifying graces, the means of cleansing the soul from sin, and enriching it with justice and sanctity, capable of loss, diminution, or increase, according as there is, or is not, a correspondence with the favors and graces bestowed.

---

## CHAPTER XXI.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION—ITS MATTER AND FORM—ITS EFFECTS—ITS MINISTER—ITS SUBJECT—ITS NECESSITY.

The term, extreme unction, of itself indicates that it is an anointing made on the Christian when in extremity, and it is so called, because it is the last of those anointings provided by Jesus Christ to contribute to the sanctification of men. It is also called the sacrament of the *infirm* or *sick*, because it was instituted for such as by sickness are brought into the danger of death. Extreme Unction is thus defined: It is a sacrament in which, by an anointing with a sacred oil and a certain formula of prayer, a celestial virtue is given to sick persons for the healing and strengthening of the soul, and sometimes even of the body. It is of faith, that Extreme Unction is a true sacrament of the new law. The Council of Trent "declares and teaches, that our most gracious Redeemer,—who would have his servants at all times provided with salutary remedies against all the weapons of all their enemies,—as, in the other sacraments, He prepared the greatest aids, whereby, during life, Christians may preserve them-



selves whole from every more grievous spiritual evil, so did he guard the close of life, by the sacrament of Extreme Unction, as with a most firm defence."\* It further pronounces anathema against any one who saith "that it is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle, St. James." †

The words of St. James are very clear to prove that this sacred rite has all the essentials of a sacrament. His words are as follows: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." ‡ We have here the plain teaching of the Apostle as to the matter, the form, and the minister of this sacrament, as stated by the Council of Trent. It is an outward sign or symbol, as such anointing is a thing *visible*, and it is efficacious to confer grace for the remission of sin, the healing and strengthening of the soul, and relief of the body. The Apostle orders it "in the name of the Lord," and indeed it must have been instituted by Jesus Christ, because only he could attach to such an outward rite the efficacy of grace and the effects promised. To say that St. James ordered this to be done, by *his own authority*, is disrespectful to an inspired Apostle and to his Epistle, which is held to be the inspired word of God. He could not have stated that such an outward act, when performed, with the prayer of faith, by the priests of the church, would "save the sick," and be the means of "forgiving his sins," unless this was declared to him by his divine master and instructor; nor could he, writing under divine inspiration, have left this record to the whole church of God in the future, if Jesus Christ did not intend it to be a perpetual sacrament in his church. The injunction is

\* Council Trent. Sess. xiv: ch. ix. † Ibid. Can. 1, on the sacrament of Extreme Unction. ‡ St. James v: 14, 15.

for all times, when any is sick, to call in the priests of the church, that they may anoint the sick with oil, while reciting "the prayer of faith."

Nor will it be reasonable to say, as some have done, that the Apostles were accustomed to anoint the sick with oil, in order to work miracles and cure their bodies of disease, and that no permanent sacrament was understood by them, or intended by Jesus Christ. Though St. Mark relates that "the Apostles anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them,"\* it is not certain that even the anointing here referred to was not also *sacramental*, and the Council of Trent seems to favor the opinion that it was sacramental, when it says that "this sacrament was insinuated indeed in Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle, and brother of our Lord." But supposing that the anointing mentioned in St. Mark was not sacramental, it would not follow that the anointing promulgated by St. James, is not sacramental, since it has all that can be required for a sacrament, and does not merely concern the healing of the body, but the healing of the soul by God's grace, and the forgiveness of sins. If the Apostles anointed with oil only to cure the body, and St. James orders an anointing with oil and the prayer of faith, to save the sick and to forgive his sins, what he orders is something more than what they did in the cases mentioned in St. Mark, if it be held they only anointed in order to cure the body; and what they did would be as the type and shadow of the sacrament promulgated by St. James. If St. James only meant the cure of the body, why did he not say this? and why not cure the lame, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb in the same manner; and not, as he has done, limit this anointing to the sick? And as the power of miracles was granted to any of the faithful, and promised to faith, why specify the calling for "the priests of the church" to perform this anointing and to recite the prayer of faith, if he were not

---

\* Mark vi.

speaking of a sacramental institution? The gift of miracles was not limited to any rite, nor limited to the priests of the church, nor even bestowed upon all priests, and hence, what St. James enjoins is different, as it especially requires the intervention of "the priests of the church," and, besides the healing of the body when for the salvation of the soul, it looks particularly to the welfare of the soul, to cleanse it from sin, and to strengthen it with grace under the fearful temptations of the last hours of life. As the rest of the chapter is directed to Christians of all classes and of all times, and regards us as well as those who first read it, so must this also, as there should be always sick persons in need of help in the last hours of their lives, and always priests of the church to anoint them with oil and pray over them, as the Apostle directs. If he meant merely the cure of the body, all who obeyed him would be always cured, and none would die, but such as neglected this injunction; and either his positive declaration would not be true, or Christians would have continued to avail themselves of this injunction to defer death. He places no limit as to time, and he wrote this about twenty-eight years after the ascension of our Lord, when already many had become converts. But it is not probable that an inspired Apostle of the Lord would thus give a general injunction to call the priests to anoint with oil, in order to work a miraculous cure of the sick, since the health of the body is not always useful to the soul, nor always to be obtained from God by prayers, God refusing temporal things when not for the good of those who ask them. And as the Apostle distinctly mentions "*the forgiveness of sin,*" as the end to be obtained by this rite, and as his mission chiefly regarded the reconciliation of sinners to God, we must believe that he chiefly had the interests of the souls of men in his mind, when writing this injunction to those who should find themselves seriously sick. He therefore, under divine instruction, was promulgating a sacrament to be permanent in the church.

The church has always understood that the Apostle

spoke here of one of the sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ. For, incidentally, it is thus referred to by different fathers in the first ages of Christianity, when, during the persecutions and troubles, it could scarcely happen that the apologists and writers would have occasion or need to speak plainly about it, because by the sick it would be piously received as a recognized usage, seeing that many even recovered the health of the body by it, and because numbers, under the sword of martyrdom, had to leave the world by a death, in which they *could not receive it*. But when the persecutions ceased, and quiet reigned within the borders of the church, the testimonies, to show how the faith had been handed down concerning it, become more distinct and numerous, until we find that in all parts of the world, by the Greek church, the oriental sects, and the Latin church, it is believed and used as a sacrament, and declared to be such on the authority of apostolical tradition, and of the sacred Scriptures as read in the epistle of St. James the Apostle. Had this not been the faith delivered, it could not have happened, that so many churches, separated from the Catholic church, would be found agreeing with her, that it is one of the seven sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ. Testimonies are brought from Origen,\* St. John Chrysostom,† St. Cyril of Alexandria,‡ and St. Augustin.§ Pope Innocent I, who took his seat in 402, says expressly that it is a sacrament, and not to be given to those to whom the other sacraments would be refused.||

The Council of Nice mentions the oil of the infirm as distinct from the holy chrism, and the oil of Catechumens. Several other councils, some of them not general yet ancient, and of great authority, have canons on Extreme Unction. Those of Constance, of Florence,¶ and of Trent,\*\* declare what is the doc-

---

\* Orig. in Levit. Hom. ii. † Lib. iii. de Sacerdot. ‡ Lib. vi. de Ador. in Spir. § Aug. in Speculo. et Serin. cccv. ¶ Inn. Ep. ad Decentium. ¶ Counc. Florence, and Decree of Pope Eugene IV. ad Armenos, in 1440. \*\* In Loco. cit.



trine of faith upon this point, and every one is required to believe that it is a sacrament of the New Law.

And reason, if left to decide impartially, ought to dispose men willingly to believe a doctrine so consoling in itself, and so expressive of the provident mercy, and goodness of the author of our faith. He not only provides divine aid for man in the beginning, and through the progress of life, by means of efficacious sacraments, where the outward sign, which he has chosen, is a memorial and pledge of the spiritual help bestowed, but he remembers him at the decisive and terrifying hour of death, and is still beside him with a sacrament to furnish the help which the Christian is most in need of just then, when the body, weak and suffering, afflicts the soul that is about to free itself from its tabernacle of clay, and causes it to dread the dawning of eternity, the judgment seat of God, the scales in which its faith and works are to be weighed, and the powerful efforts of the devil, who, seeing that his time is short, is the more active to tempt to presumption or despair. With this sacrament, Jesus Christ strengthens the body to bear its sufferings, patiently and in the spirit of penance, washes the soul from the sins that may remain, removes its languor, excites the influences of faith, hope, and charity within it, and, even at times, when necessary for its salvation, gives it further time to work out its salvation. Why should any be unwilling to believe in this mercy of God? The cross of Christ, with the unction of the holy oil and the deprecatory prayer of faith, is signed upon the senses of the body, those doors to the soul, that even when the soul leaves, for a time, its decaying tabernacle of flesh, the ruins may be laid away as sacred to await the hour of resurrection, and that survivors may learn from this care of Christ for the members of his mystic body, what a high dignity it is, and what a blessing to be a true Christian.

*Of the Matter and the Form of this Sacrament.*

St. James has indicated oil as the *remote* matter of

this sacrament, "anointing him with oil." The proximate matter is the unction itself, made with the oil. The only kind of oil admitted as the matter of this sacrament, is oil expressed from *olives*, such as was used at the time, and which by excellence has this name of oil. The Council of Trent says: "For the church has understood the matter thereof to be oil blessed by a bishop. For the unction very aptly represents the grace of the Holy Ghost, with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed."\* It has been a constant precept and discipline in the church, that this oil for the sick, as well as that for baptism and the holy chrism, should be consecrated by a bishop, but no express decision has been made that this blessing by a bishop is essential to *the truth* and *validity* of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, though indisputably necessary by precept. Many theologians, of great name and authority, consider the blessing of the oil by a bishop as essential to the validity of Extreme Unction, which, in practice, is the opinion to be followed. Pope Eugenius IV., in his decree to the Armenians, writes: "The matter of Extreme Unction is olive oil, blessed by a bishop."† The Council of Trent says that the church has learned this from tradition.

The form of this sacrament consists of the following words used by the priest at each anointing, with a change to suit the part of the body anointed: "Through this holy unction, and his own most tender mercy, may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins thou hast committed by thy sight," "by thy hearing," ‡ &c. It is called by St. James "the prayer of faith," not that it depends on the faith of him who recites it, but because it is dictated by faith, and by faith alone understood as a sacra-

---

\* Conc. Trent, Sess. XIV, on Ex. Unc. Ch. 1. † Decret. ad Armenos.

‡ The rubric or rule prescribes an unction for each of the senses, that for the sense of touch being two-fold, that is on the hands and feet. For males, an unction for the loins or small of the back is prescribed, but because of the difficulty of moving the sick and inconvenience to them, seldom used. In urgent cases one anointing suffices, which is made on the head as the seat of the senses,

mental word, which, in union with the Unction, forms the sacrament. In this form it is to be noted, that, by the words, are expressed: 1st, the principal cause, viz: the mercy of God; 2d, the instrumental cause, that is, the sacred unction; and 3d, the effect, which is the remission of sins, and consequently the health of the body when for the benefit of the soul, in as much as sin is often a cause of sickness, and, by a removal of the cause, the body may more easily be restored to health; for our Saviour, when he cured the person at the probatic pond, said to him: "Behold thou art made whole: sin no more, lest some worse thing happen to thee."\*

This form is deprecatory, or in the form of a prayer, as commanded by the Apostle: "Let them pray over him," and, while it expresses the effect, it also determines the matter, which is the sacred unction; although indeed an indicative form could also include prayer, and, should the church prescribe such, might avail in the administration of this sacrament. Some, with Bellarmine, among various reasons why the form should be deprecatory, assign as a chief reason, that this sacrament is the complement of the sacrament of penance, and as it were the penance of the infirm, who cannot any longer do works of penance. In it, the mercy of God operates, and an appeal is made to that mercy in behalf of the sinner: "May the Lord pardon thee," &c.

### *Of its Effects.*

It is of faith, that the sacrament of Extreme Unction confers grace, remits sins, and relieves the sick. The Council of Trent expresses these effects in its chapter on the effects of this sacrament, saying: "Moreover the thing signified, and the effect of this sacrament are explained in these words: *And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in his sins, they shall be forgiven him.* For the thing here signified is the grace of the

---

\* John v: 14.

Holy Ghost, whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins; and *raises up* and strengthens the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him a great confidence in the divine mercy, whereby the sick being supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness; and more readily resists the temptations of the devil, who *lies in wait for his heel*; and at times obtains bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of his soul."\* All have to admit the doctrine as here stated by the Council. Theologians may discuss whether Extreme Unction remits only venial sins, directly, and whether it remits mortal sins, directly or indirectly. While agreeing that baptism and penance were instituted for the direct end of remitting mortal sins, and classing Extreme Unction among the sacraments of the living, which suppose the state of grace in him who receives them, they all admit that Extreme Unction remits mortal sins, if any remain in the soul to be expiated, when it is administered. All agree that the sinner, when he has it in his power, should receive the sacrament of Penance before Extreme Unction. They agree that if after receiving absolution, the person had unknowingly contracted the guilt of mortal sin, or was not as well disposed as requisite when receiving absolution, then this sacrament, received with attrition, would remit such sins, as well as any other remains of sin that might be in the soul. Some say it would do this directly, others secondarily only. But the sinner, receiving the benefit, need not care which opinion is better grounded. As St. James says: "If he be in his sins, they shall be forgiven;" and the sacramental form is general, "Whatever sins," and the Council of Trent speaks in general terms: "Whose anointing cleanses away sins," it would seem that, in the circumstances required, this sacrament, directly and of itself and not merely by accident, remits mortal sins in the last hours of life, because instituted for this end.

---

\* Counc. Trent, Sess. xiv: ch. ix, on Ext. Unc., ch. ii.



And though this grace is proper to this sacrament in the said circumstances, it is still true that it was not instituted particularly for bestowing the *first* grace, or the grace of reconciliation, but rather a grace to augment the sanctification of the soul, to efface lighter faults, to dissipate the languors which sin leaves in the soul, to complete the work of its cure, and reaching to the body to relieve the weight of its sufferings, and solace the whole man. It also helps to remove something of the debt of punishment due to past sins, and often restores the body to health. When on the confines of life, and about to pass the abyss which separates the world of time from that of eternity, what a consolation to have such aids as this sacrament affords!

*Of the Minister of Extreme Unction.*

It is a doctrine of faith, taught by the fathers and councils, that only priests validly ordained, and bishops, can administer this sacrament. The Council of Trent, referring to the text of St. James, says: "It is there shown, that the proper ministers of this sacrament are the *Presbyters of the church*; by which name are to be understood, in that place, not the elders by age, or the foremost in dignity amongst the people, but either bishops, or priests by bishops rightly ordained by the *imposition* of the hands of the Priesthood."\* In canon IV. on Extreme Unction, it pronounces anathema on those who deny that only priests ordained by bishops, or bishops are the proper ministers of this sacrament. Although any priest validly ordained can administer this sacrament validly, yet, by decree of the church, he cannot do so lawfully unless he have jurisdiction, or is deputed by one who has this power. St. James says: "Bring in the *priests* of the church," but the word *Presbuterous* signifying priests, is ambiguous, and may mean *elders* in age or dignity, and so is translated by opponents of the Catholic doctrine, that it may

---

\* Sess. XIV., Ch. III.

favor their repudiation of this sacrament. But in the New Testament it is used to signify the ministers of religion or priests, and so is understood by the fathers and by the church. St. Paul tells Timothy not to neglect the grace which was given to him "*with the imposition of the hands of the priesthood,*" *Presbuterion*, meaning presbyters who had themselves received ordination "with the imposition of hands," or priests. Timothy was not an elder, but very young: "Let no man despise thy youth," but he was ordained priest and bishop, and had authority over those of more advanced age. It is of such, who had been ordained by the imposition of hands, that St. James speaks, and not of mere lay-elders.

His words, call in "*the priests,*" have given some the thought to object against the practice of the church in allowing this sacrament to be administered by one priest only. Among the Greeks, the custom is found of calling seven priests to anoint a sick person, and they say that they intend a mystery in this number. This is a matter pertaining to use and discipline, but to the validity of the sacrament, one priest administering it is sufficient, as maintained by the Catholic church in her teaching and practice. The words of St. James, call in "*the priests,*" are not to be understood of the number, although he uses the plural, but of the quality of the persons to be called. He does not mean to say that numbers of priests must be called to each sick person, but that for sick persons priests are to be called. As if he said: "When any one is sick, call any of the priests of the church," just as in saying, confess your sins to the priests, we would not mean that each person should confess to many priests, but each confess to a priest.

*Of its Subject, or of those to Receive it.*

The subject of this sacrament or the person to receive it, is, first a Christian, or baptized person, for, writing to Christians, the Apostle says: is any one "*among*

you." 2d. A sick person, as is clear from his words, "is any one sick," and he means a person grievously or seriously sick, as the church teaches that it is to be given to those who are sick and whose death is feared. Hence, it is called the sacrament of the dying. But not every one about to die can receive it, but only those about to die from sickness or disease. A person might receive a fatal wound, which, not taking life immediately, would produce a sickness unto death, and make him capable to receive this sacrament. But the healthy about to die from battle, or under judicial sentence, are not capable of it. Those who are dying from old age, are dying from a general decay and malady, and are reputed among the sick.

3d. It must be an adult person; or one who has the use of reason and is capable of sin. Infants therefore and perpetual idiots are not capable of receiving this sacrament.

4th. As taught by Innocent I, the excommunicated are not to receive it unless absolved from their excommunication, nor sinners before receiving the sacrament of Penance, if able to make their confession. Neither are those who have been or are still living publicly in sin, unless willing to repair the scandal they give.

5th. It ought not to be conferred on those, who neither by expressed, nor by tacit and legitimately presumed intention, consent to receive it.

Extreme Unction is not repeated for a person who remains in peril from the same sickness, but if he recovers his health, and is again brought into a similar danger of death, he can again be aided by this sacrament.

#### *Of the Necessity of Extreme Unction.*

This sacrament is not of what is termed absolute necessity, or necessary as an *indispensable means* of salvation, but it is necessary by a *divine precept* for all who find themselves dangerously sick. The injunction of the Apostle is to be thus understood. The Council

of Trent represents this sacrament as "having a command from God," and that it cannot be contemned "without a heinous sin, and an injury to the Holy Ghost Himself."\* A person, who thought little of this salutary remedy, and cared not to receive it when in danger of death from sickness, would show the worst dispositions, and a want of proper faith. By this sacrament, many souls have been saved who otherwise would have been forever lost.†

From this exposition, it must appear how foolish those persons are, who, being sick, dread to receive this sacrament lest they may die the sooner, and defer receiving it as long as they can, thus exposing themselves to miss it altogether, or to receive it in a state of unconsciousness, when they cannot, in union with the priest while he anoints the different senses, feel and express their sorrow for the sins which they have committed through their agency. Persons wise unto salvation, when in peril from sickness, will hasten to have the aid of whatever sacraments have been provided for Christians in such circumstances, and not run a risk of the loss of their soul, from a vain fear that they will die any the sooner by being prepared for death,

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDER—ORDER EMBRACES DIFFERENT DEGREES—IT IS A TRUE SACRAMENT—OF DEACONS—OF PRIESTS—OF BISHOPS—THE FOUR MINOR ORDERS, VIZ: OF PORTER, LECTOR, EXORCIST, ACOLYTE—THE FIRST TONSURE—OF THE MATTER AND FORM—OF THE EFFECTS, 1ST. GRACE, 2D. THE CHARACTER—OF THE MINISTER—OF THE SUBJECT AND THE CONDITIONS REQUIRED IN THE SUBJECT.

The five sacraments which we have already consider-

---

\* Council. Trent, Sess. XIV, Ch. III. † St. Ch. Bor. Act. Mediol. Ecc. P. I, p. 449.



ed, are of special interest to individuals, and meet their wants in the work of their salvation from the cradle to the grave, providing them with graces to enable them to live and die holily, while, in their influences upon individuals, they contribute to the good of society also, but for the administration of them, it is necessary that there should be selected persons qualified to discharge such sacred functions, in an effective and proper manner. These persons must have the character of minister of Jesus Christ, and, with it, the powers to perform these functions, and the grace to do so in a way worthy and becoming. Though the efficacy of the sacraments do not depend upon the moral worth of the minister, they however require a duly empowered minister, and it is fit and proper that such minister should be holy through the aid of divine grace, as he has to dispense to others the means of grace and holiness. Our Saviour, in the interest of all men, for whom he died, and to whom he came to offer the means of salvation, chose, appointed, and empowered his first ministers and the dispensers of his mysteries, he *ordained* them for this work, and gave them gifts and graces, which fitted them to discharge their sacred functions worthily and fruitfully. He fully instructed them how they were to prepare others to supply their places, and how these their successors in so sacred a ministry, should be fitted for their holy office. Where such great powers were to be conferred, and such holy duties to be performed, there was evident need of a *sacred rite* for setting apart and distinguishing the persons selected, and need also of divine graces corresponding to their high vocation. Hence, the institution of the sacrament of Holy Order. As it is designed for calling certain men to share in the eternal priesthood of Christ, and making them the visible representatives of his invisible ministrations, it is like the fountain, from which are to flow the other channels of grace for healing, purifying, elevating, and adorning our poor weak nature, and fitting it for the glory of immortality. St. Ignatius, who lived in the first age of the church, beautifully expressed this when he said: "The priest-

hood or priestly office, is the apex or summit of all the good things that are among men."\* The whole supernatural society of regenerated men is vivified and sustained by the sacraments, dispensed by the priests, who owe their character, powers, and fitness to the sacrament of Holy Order. This society is taught, assisted, maintained and governed, by those who have been sealed by this sacrament. And although like the other sacraments, it has its proper grace to augment the sanctity of the individual who receives it, it has a wider and more social range in bestowing upon him powers and graces for the benefit of the whole Christian society, making him the authorized agent of Jesus Christ for distributing spiritual goods and gifts to enrich and sanctify the souls of the members, and, on their behalf and, as representing Christ their divine head and the mediator between God and men, to stand publicly at the altars of God, as priests to offer up "the clean oblation" which God indicated by his prophet as the evidence of his greatness and glory among the Gentiles, or the nations of the earth.†

The hierarchy which existed under the ancient law was a figure of a more noble hierarchy under the new law. The ancient priesthood was transferred with the law, and a new priesthood established. A body of ministers charged with all that belongs to divine worship, or a hierarchy, for the government of the Christian society, having different orders pertaining to the priesthood, was constituted in the church. That, in the church, there is such a hierarchy is a doctrine of faith. The Council of Trent declares anathema against "any one who saith, that in the Catholic church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordination instituted, consisting of bishops, priests and ministers;" and against "any who saith, that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood; or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of

---

\* Sacerdotium est apex bonorum omnium quae sunt in hominibus. Ep. 10 ad Smyrnas. † Malachy i: 11.

the Lord, and of forgiving and retaining sins; but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all.\*

The Holy Scriptures express this doctrine. St. Paul says: "Now you are the body of Christ, and members of member. And God indeed hath set some in the church first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors, &c. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all doctors?"† "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."‡ For the service of "the body of Christ," in its relation to man's salvation, both for that body which was "fitted to him" for the sacrifice, and for his mystic "body which is the church," was this hierarchy constituted with its different degrees of order. And the sacred functions may be said to be four, two of which regard the natural body of Jesus Christ, viz: The offering of the holy sacrifice of mass, and the service of the altar; and two, his mystic body, or the members of his church, viz: The instruction of the people, and the administration of the sacraments.

Before proceeding further, we may remark the distinction that exists between *order* and *ordination*. Order signifies a certain relation between things; and when applied to men, it indicates superior and inferior relations between them. It is used to designate classes of persons constituted in degrees. When taken for the act by which a person is constituted in any particular degree, it is called *ordination*. Order is something fixed and permanent, and we speak of persons as belonging to an order, and say he can *exercise* such order, or perform the functions pertaining to the order. But ordination is a transient action of the person who confers the Order that he may aggregate another or qualify him. In religion, it is a benediction or consecration of

---

\* Counc. Trent, Sess. XXIII. - Canons on Sacrament of Order.

† 1 Cor. xii: 28. ‡ Ephes. iv: 11, 12.

any one by means of prescribed words and ceremonies. As ordination is the placing of a person in some order of ministers, and making him fit to perform the offices or functions of the order, the term order was at length applied to designate this inaugurating act itself.

*Holy Order is a Sacrament.*

Throughout the history of the church, down to the time of the *Waldenses*, no one arose to deny that the rite, for ordaining the ministers of God, or of Holy Order, is a true sacrament of the new law. That it is a true sacrament is a doctrine of faith, and the Council of Trent pronounces anathema on any one "who says that order, or sacred ordination, is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and of the sacraments."\*

Holy Order may be thus defined: It is a sacrament of the New Law, by which spiritual power and grace are given to the ministers of Jesus Christ, for rightly discharging the offices or functions of religion, which concern the worship of God and the salvation of souls.

It is proved to be a sacrament because it has all that can be required for a sacrament, viz: An external rite, the promise and bestowal of grace, and the command of God, or divine institution.

The *imposition of hands* by the bishop, the accompanying prayer, and other exterior words and signs, constitute an external sensible sign or rite. By this rite grace is conferred and the power to perform ecclesiastical functions, such as offering the sacrifice of the mass, administering the sacraments, forgiving and retaining sins, and the various acts of the ministry. And this by God's arrangement and command, because only the divine power could enable an external rite, with the

---

\* Counc. Trent, Sess. XXIII, Can. IV.



accompanying words, to bestow grace, which is his gift.

The divine Scriptures show us this rite with the attendant grace, and remove all reason for objection or doubt on this subject, which we ought to believe, even were it not seen in Scriptures, as we have to receive other things, on the testimony of the church, because she was commissioned to teach the truths of religion with the co-operation of Christ, and with the aid of the Holy Ghost. We read in Acts, ch. vi: 6, in regard to the ordination of the deacons who are there named: "These they set before the Apostles; and they praying imposed hands upon them." Again we see the ordination of Saul and Barnabas in Acts, ch. xiii: 2. "And as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them. Then they, fasting, and praying, and imposing hands upon them, sent them away." This preparation of Saul and Barnabas was done under the direction of the Holy Ghost, and done by prayer and the imposition of hands. It was undoubtedly the means appointed by Jesus Christ, who, in giving instruction to his Apostles, could not have failed, upon this most important of all matters, to indicate clearly how they were to fit the persons for it whom they should call to aid them in the ministry. Their practice is evidence of his instructions and command. They knew that this rite conferred the power and grace necessary for the work of the ministry. The apostle, whose ordination we have seen, Saul, better known as St. Paul, writes to Timothy, whom he had himself ordained: "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of the priesthood."\* To the same Timothy he gives this injunction: "Impose not hands lightly on any man, neither be partaker of other men's sins."† And again: "For which cause I admonish thee, that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the

---

\* 1 Tim. iv: 14. † 1 Tim. v: 22.

imposition of my hands.”\* In these texts we observe that the grace of God is attached to this rite of ordination by the imposition of hands. And the Apostle shows that he does not speak of the grace given merely for others, or the power of miracles, but of sanctifying grace, since he says to Timothy: “For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of sobriety,”† and, therefore, grace which sanctifies.

It will be no fair objection to say that the apostles used the imposition of hands to cure the sick, as may be seen in Mark xvi: “They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover,” and, consequently, that imposition of hands is not a sacrament. Every imposition of hands is not a sacrament, nor is every ablution with water a sacrament. But an imposition of hands for ordaining a person to the ministry, and which bestows grace, is a sacrament, as an ablution with water and the word for baptism is also a sacrament. When St. Paul imposed hands on Timothy and conferred the grace which he calls upon him to excite within him, he performed a sacramental rite. Jesus Christ had the power to attach, to the imposition of hands by his minister, the grace of a sacrament, as well as to give to it the power of curing the sick. If then the people beheld the sick cured by the imposition of hands, when this was done expressly to cure the sick, they would readily infer that when a similar imposition of hands was made in order expressly to ordain a person to the ministry and to give him sacramental grace, the effect, though invisible, would follow as certainly, as in the other case the sick were visibly cured. The one imposition of hands, for its express purpose having its designed effect, would be a guarantee that the other imposition of hands for a higher purpose, but for producing an unseen result, would also produce the effect intended. The Scriptures show that the Apostles ordained deacons, priests, and bishops by the imposition of

---

\* 2 Tim. i: 6. † Ibid. i: 7.

hands and prayer, conferring by this rite spiritual power and grace, and they could only have done this according to the command and instruction of Jesus Christ, who had himself appointed and ordained them. "The church," says Tertullian, "received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God."\* The Scriptures then manifest that Order is a true sacrament. The testimony of early fathers and councils are numerous to show that this has always been a received doctrine of faith. St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch and martyr, Tertullian, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Leo, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, the fathers of the general council of Chalcedon, in 451, Pope Anastasius II, St. Gregory the Great, and many others, might be cited, if necessary. But the faith and general practice, both of the Latin and Greek church, is so clear as to this tenet, that it is needless to dwell upon it longer.

*Holy Order embraces Different Degrees.*

The term order implies degrees, and, as used to designate the sacrament in question, it includes several degrees, which are usually reckoned seven in number, in the Catholic church. Three of these are called sacred or greater orders, and four are termed minor orders. In the ascending scale they are thus named: *Porter*, or *Doorkeeper*, *Lector* or *Reader*, *Exorcist*, *Acolyte*, *Sub-deacon*, *Deacon*, and *Priest*. The last named is the summit of the scale, to which the others tend, and for the dignity and service of which they have been instituted. But the last named, while its genus is one, contains two species, distinct indeed, the one superior to the other; but the superior containing all that belongs to the inferior rank; these are the distinct ranks in the hierarchy, of bishops and of priests, who with the deacons properly form the hierarchy, and are the three classes of sacred officers mentioned in the Scriptures,

---

\* Tertul. De praescript, Cap. xxi.

as constituted over the members of the church, for watching over them, ministering to them, and serving them. The definition of the church that there are seven sacraments, with their specific names, establishes the doctrine that Holy Order, however numerous its degrees, is but one sacrament. And while the church has not defined, that in Holy Order there are only seven degrees, or that the priesthood might not be reached by fewer degrees, as appears to be the case with the Greeks, who only recognize four, yet from a very early period, we find the orders as now numbered with us, given by writers and doctors, and these seven are mentioned by the Council of Trent, as having been in use from the very beginning of the church with their appropriate names and ministrations.\* The council gives the reason why these degrees exist, saying: "Whereas the ministry of so holy a priesthood is a divine thing; to the end it might be exercised in a more worthy manner, and with greater veneration, it was suitable that, in the most well ordered settlement of the church, there should be several and diverse orders of ministers, to minister to the priesthood, by virtue of their office."† These orders are not of equal rank, and are divided into greater and minor orders, as defined in canon ii. of this council. Sub-deaconship is put last in the class of the greater or sacred orders, although not mentioned in the Scriptures, it being the more common opinion that this order, with the four minor orders, were instituted by the church. But because of the obligation of celibacy, of the obligation to recite the Breviary, or the divine office, and of the more close relation in which this minister stands to the functions of the altar and sacrifice, his order, with apparently good reasons, is by some regarded as having the sacramental value, since he would appear to need sacramental grace for the proper fulfilment of his sacred duties.

However, with respect to sub-deaconship, and the

---

\* Sess. xxiii: chap. 11. † Ibid. ch. 11.



four minor orders, it is disputed among theologians whether or not they have the value of a sacrament. Many theologians think they are not sacraments. But the opinion which considers these as flowing by lawful development, as needed by the wants of the church, from the diaconship, which was instituted under divine direction, and as being parts thereof, and therefore in some manner partaking of its sacramental value, seems to be in harmony with the sacredness of the offices, and sufficiently probable. The probability of their being sacramental is greater, the nearer such order is connected with the diaconship, which is its fountain. The church has made no definition on this point.

### *Of the Order of Deacons.*

As to diaconship itself, there is a general agreement among Catholic theologians and doctors that it is a sacrament. It has all the requisites of a sacrament, viz: 1st. The external rite, or imposition of hands with prayer, for thus were the first seven deacons ordained, as seen in *the Acts of the Apostles*; “and praying, they imposed hands on them.” 2dly. In the ordination the bishop says: “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c., and by prayer invokes the Holy Ghost for fitting them for their ministry, which would be useless words, if grace be not thereby conferred. 3dly. The Apostles thus ordained the deacons by direction from Christ, as testified by one who lived with them, St. Clement, pope, who says: “The Apostles established bishops and deacons according to the order which they had received from Jesus Christ.”\* And St. Ignatius also of the apostolic age, and disciple of St. John, writes: “Respect the deacons as exercising their ministry after the order of God.”† The Council of Trent declares that the ministers or deacons belong to *the hierarchy established by God.* ‡

---

\* 1st Ep. ad. cor. St. Clem. † Ep. ad Smyrn. ‡ Sess. xxiii: can. vi.

Though the belief that deaconship is a sacrament is so general, that scarcely any theologians of note, except Durandus and Cajetan, are found denying it, yet it is not of faith, since the church has not expressly defined it, nor is it clearly manifest in the Scriptures, nor declared by tradition. Nevertheless it appears certain that it is a sacrament, from the manner in which the Scriptures speak of the first deacons, and the qualities required in these ministers, and also from St. Paul, in his epistle to the Philippians, first chapter, and in his first epistle to Timothy, third chapter, exacting almost the same qualities and the same virtues of the deacons as he does of the priests or bishops.

Though the occasion upon which the Apostles first chose deacons was the difficulty of serving the people at the tables, and these deacons were appointed to relieve and aid them in this, yet this temporal work was not the chief end of their ministry. For at the time of the repast, it was then customary also to offer the sacrifice and distribute the Holy Communion, and the chief functions of the deacons or ministers pertained to the holy sacrifice and communion, and to the instruction and religious conduct of the people, although they had also charge of the administration of the temporal interests of the congregations. In the Scriptures, we find that the first deacons preached the gospel and conferred baptism, as said of Stephen and Philip in the 6th and 8th chapters of the Acts. The deacons therefore were by the Apostles made sharers in the work of the ministry, and ordained for this by prayer and imposition of hands, and it is not to be supposed that the Apostles would have shared their ministry with them without particular instruction and authorization from Jesus Christ. Hence, we have seen, that St. Clement and St. Ignatius, who lived with them, declared that the Apostles did this by the order of Jesus Christ.\* St. Polycarp, like Ignatius, a disciple of St. John the Apostle, says, "Deacons ought to be blameless as the minis-

---

\* Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. et ad Trallian.

ters of Christ and of God, and not of men.”\* The same saint recommends Christians “to be subject to the priests and deacons, as to God and Christ.” When the Council of Trent declares that the whole hierarchy was established by God, and that this hierarchy consists of bishops, priests, and deacons, it seems to us that the fathers of this council not only judged that the order of deacons was of divine institution, but also that it was an integral part of the sacrament, which is termed “sacred ordination” or “order.” To be order, there must be in it more than one degree, and since the council gives three degrees for the hierarchy, it would appear to be also its sentiment, that these three degrees at least are portions of the one sacrament of order, or have, each of them, the value of a sacrament. The deacons are always by the early writers and fathers, numbered with the priests and bishops as pertaining to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. They rank next to the priest, and besides aiding in the ministry by preaching and baptizing, it is their office to serve the priest or bishop when offering the holy sacrifice.

### *Of the Priesthood.*

The priesthood contains two ranks, which are species of the same genus, viz: bishops and priests, and, as constituted for the offering of sacrifice, it is one order, although in that order, as, under the ancient law, with the high priest and the rest of the priests serving for the sacrifices, there are two distinct ranks.† The Council of Trent says: “sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy vis-

\* Polyc. ad Philip.

† Philo, in his life of Moses, counts two degrees of the hierarchy, “The priests, and those who were occupied in the service of the temple,” but places the high priest in the first rank and the others in the second.—*Chardon Hist. des Sacraments.*

ible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it must needs also be confessed, that there is in that church a new, visible, and external priesthood into which the old has been translated. And the sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic church has always taught that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour, and that to the Apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering his Body and Blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins."\*

Speaking first of priests of the second rank, it is the unanimous belief of all Catholics that the priesthood is a sacrament. The Council of Trent pronounces anathema against "any one who saith, that, by sacred ordination, the Holy Ghost is not given; and that vainly therefore do the bishops say, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*; or that a character is not imprinted by that ordination; or that he who has once been a priest, can again become a layman."†

It is then of faith, that the person who is ordained a priest receives divine grace and an indelible character by the rite of ordination, and consequently that this ordination is a sacrament. Besides, no one who admits that there is in the new law such a sacrament as Holy Order, ever thinks of denying that it is found in the order of priests.

### *Of Bishops.*

The pre-eminence of bishops over priests seems never to have been questioned in the church, until the time of Acrius, who maintained that bishops and priests are of equal dignity and power, as we learn from St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine, who, for this, condemn him as a heretic.‡ During three centuries and a half, this superiority was not questioned. No Catholic can deny this superiority without also being guilty of heresy, for

---

\* Sess. XXIII, Ch. I. † Ibid, Can. IV. ‡ Epiph. Hæresi 75, n. 3. St. Aug. de Hæresi, Cap. LIII.



the Council of Trent pronounces anathema against "any one who saith that bishops are not superior to priests; or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining; or that the power they possess is common to them and to priests."\* It is then of faith, that they are by divine institution superior to priests, and are invested with powers which priests have not, and can perform certain sacred functions, such as conferring ordination and administering confirmation, and performing many other things which priests are not competent to do, simply as priests. For the Council says: "Wherefore, the Holy Synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded to the place of the Apostles, principally belong to this hierarchical order; that they are *placed*, as the Apostle says, *by the Holy Ghost, to rule the church of God*; that they are superior to priests; administer the sacrament of confirmation; ordain the ministers of the church; and that they can perform very many other things; over which functions others of an inferior order have no power."†

The Council has declared, that the hierarchy is constituted by God, and that bishops *principally* belong to it, and therefore are superior by divine law to the other members of it, who are the priests and ministers, or deacons.

Throughout the history of the church; we find that the bishops are spoken of as the successors of the Apostles, and the priests as the successors of the seventy-two disciples. The Apostles were evidently constituted by Jesus Christ in a rank superior to the disciples. He chose twelve of the disciples to make them apostles. He retained them with him, and instructed them thoroughly. To them he said, "*as my Father hath sent me, I send you.*" St. Peter understood the difference of rank, when he proposed, after the treachery of Judas, to invoke the Holy Ghost to know which of the disciples should be selected to supply his place

---

\* Sess. XXIII, Can. VII. † Ibid, Chap. IV.

in the ministry and in the apostleship, and Mathias was accordingly chosen. Had the disciples been equal with the Apostles, there would have been no need of an appeal to the Holy Ghost to number Mathias with them. The successors of the Apostles must therefore be held as superior to the successors of the disciples, just as the Apostles were superior to the disciples, by the appointment of Jesus Christ. St. Paul indicates this superiority when he writes to Timothy: "Against a priest receive not an accusation; but under two or three witnesses."\* To be thus the judge of the priests, the rank of Timothy must have been higher; and we learn from tradition that Timothy had been ordained bishop. St. Paul manifests the same fact when writing to Titus, he says: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou should set in order (regulate) the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee."† Titus was appointed and ordained bishop, and had the authority to regulate every thing concerning religion, and to ordain priests or even bishops also. The disciples were accustomed to make converts and to baptize them, but the Apostles had to visit the different places in order to give the sacrament of confirmation to these new Christians, which shows that, while exercising certain functions of the ministry, there were other functions which these disciples could not perform in behalf of their converts. We may say that St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is among the best of witnesses, as he lived in Apostolic times, and he thus writes to the faithful of Magnesia: "The bishop, being in the first rank, holds the place of God, the priests represent the senate of the Apostles, and the ministry of Jesus Christ is confided to the deacons."‡

St. Clement, cotemporary with St. Peter, calls the bishop "the sovereign priest," and says that "he has duties peculiar to himself, that the priests also have their place assigned, and the Levites (Deacons) have also their ministry." Tertullian calls the bishop by

---

\* 1 Tim. v: 19. † Tit. i: 5. ‡ St. Ign. ad Magnesianos, n. 6.

the same name of *sovereign priest*.\* “Therefore,” writes St. Augustine, “is the higher place set for bishops that they may superintend, and as it were, guard the people, for what in Greek is called *Episcopos*; in Latin is interpreted superintendent, because he superintends.”†

The question is asked by theologians whether the rite for ordaining bishops is a sacrament distinct from that of the priesthood, and doctors of note are to be found on both sides of this question. Some have maintained that it is not a different sacrament and does not imprint a peculiar character, but only confers a more ample power; others, of equal learning and name, teach that it is a sacrament of the same genus, but of a distinct species, and besides conferring its proper power, imprints a new character. Again, some attempt to defend a sort of middle ground, and call it an extension of the order of priesthood, which is in the priests in a more limited manner, and in bishops in its plenitude, and that the characters are not fully distinct, nor yet one and the same, but having the difference that exists between the inchoate and the perfect. It appears to be the more commonly received teaching, with Bellarmine, and all more recent theologians, that the ordination of bishops is a sacrament distinct from the priesthood. Bellarmine declares that this is asserted by all the ancient fathers, and most of the canonists, and to him appears to be *most certain*. In this ordination are found all the requisites of a sacrament, the external rite, the bestowal of grace, and divine institution. As the Apostles, ordained by Jesus Christ, were bishops, so did they ordain as bishops, Timothy, Titus, and many others whom they placed over the different churches. The passages of Scripture, which refer to ordination by the imposition of hands, mostly refer to the ordination of bishops, and hence if those texts prove a sacrament of Order, as we must admit, they are also a proof that episcopal ordination is a sacrament. And it also im-

---

\* Tert. lib. de Bap. c. xvii. † Aug. in Psalm cxxvi.

prints a character, since it is never reiterated, and the character endures like that of the priest, and it makes the person fit to perform functions such as conferring sacred orders, and confirmation, which would be null if performed by one who had not been ordained bishop. Therefore, a bishop receives his character as such, and special spiritual powers from his ordination. As the bishop has to administer two sacraments, besides those entrusted to the priests, and has a high responsibility and important duties peculiar to his office, it would seem that he needs also a special sacramental grace to enable him worthily to perform the functions of his office. Moreover, the inauguration of the bishop, or his ordination, takes place with most solemn and significant ceremonies, and his rank is granted to him with imposition of hands and invocation of the Holy Ghost, just as the diaconship and priesthood are conferred, and as these are held to be sacraments, so should his ordination also be held to be a sacrament. Order being a sacrament, and requiring degrees, each of which is sacramental, and there being three degrees in the hierarchy as defined by the church, it must be that the principal of these three is a sacrament, as well as the two others.

Nor will it be a fair objection to say, that if episcopacy be admitted to be a sacrament, it would be necessary to hold Orders as eight in number, instead of seven, since we have already seen that the order of the priesthood is but one as to its genus, but has in it two classes of priests, or two species.\* As Bellarmine replies to this objection, we give his answer: "Orders are taken from their relation to the Eucharist, and since the highest power concerning the Eucharist is that of consecrating or making it, therefore the first order is the sacerdotal, that is the order of those who can consecrate the Eucharist; nor can any order superior to this or greater be imagined. However, because bishops and priests partake of this power in a different manner, there are thence two species of priests. Priests, in consecrating the Eucharist, at least as to the use of their power, de-



pend on the bishops who can interdict them from consecrating, or suspend them for a time, or command them to celebrate in such a place, in such a manner, at such a time. Moreover, priests do not so possess this power that they can communicate it to others; but bishops both have it, and can communicate it to others.”\*

As the person, who is ordained bishop, must of necessity have first been ordained priest, he will have the character of bishop in addition to that of priest, and if in this his character may be said to be greater, it is only because it gives him a power extending to other things, above what he has from his character of priest. But the character itself, given in episcopal ordination, when compared with the character before given to him as priest is not greater, since it is admitted that the character or quality of priest as a power to consecrate the Eucharist is in itself the greatest and most excellent that can be conferred. The superiority of the bishop arises from his having this latter, and, in addition to it, the character and power for other things conferred by episcopal ordination.

*Of the First Tonsure, and of the Four Minor Orders, or the Four Degrees which conduct to the Sacred or Greater Orders.*

The candidate for the priesthood is initiated into the ranks of the clergy by a ceremony, which is called the *First Tonsure*. It is thus named, because it is the first cutting of the hair, in the form of a crown peculiar to clerics, solemnly made by the bishop, and the crown must be afterwards kept thus cut, as the members of the clergy for a long time, and nearly every where were required thus to wear it constantly. Most theologians have considered this rite as an ancient, ecclesiastical ceremony, while some have esteemed it to be something more, and given to it an inferior rank among the minor orders. The Council of Trent, in separating it from

---

\* De Sacram. Ord. lib. i. cap. vi.

the orders, shows us that it is not to be reckoned one of them. With it, the bishop gives to the candidate the surplice or ecclesiastical dress, to indicate "the putting off of the old, and the clothing with the new man," but imparts no spiritual powers. It is a sort of preparation and noviceship for orders, in which persons are to strive to render themselves worthy to be elevated to the rank of ministers. Hence it ought to be conferred only on such as have this intention. Whatever was the time and manner of its origin, it is customary in the church for all who aspire to orders, to commence with this ceremony. The second general Council of Nice speaks of it as a thing received in the church, and some writers date its origin in the times of the Apostles.\* The tonsured are required to wear the clerical dress, and to conform their lives to the state to which they aspire. They enjoyed also several of the privileges belonging to the clergy in former times. To be initiated with the tonsure, the church requires the candidate to have already received confirmation, to know how to read and write, to be instructed in the rudiments of the faith, and that there should be a probable hope that he designs, in choosing this state, to render to God faithful service.†

The first of the minor orders conferred is that of *Porter*, or *Doorkeeper*. The name explains the office. The Porter should open and close the doors of the temple, exclude those whom the church does not wish to admit to be present at the worship, keep the deposits made by the faithful, and the sacred vestments, &c. The bishop, in conferring this order, gives the keys to be successively touched by the person ordained saying: "so act as being to render to God an account for the things which are kept under these keys."—*Counc. Carthage, IV, Can. 9, held in 398.*

The *Lector* had to read to the people the things which the bishop was about to explain, to sing the les-

\* St. Greg. of Tours, de Glor. Martyr, lib. i. cap. xxvii.

† Sess. XXIII, Ch. IV.

sons in the public office, to bless the bread and new fruit, to teach the catechism to children and Catechumens. The bishop confers this order by delivering the book from which the readings are to be made, saying: "Receive, and be reporters of God's word, if faithfully and usefully you fulfil the duties of your office, you shall have part with those who, from the beginning, have dispensed well the word of God."—*Counc. Carth. IV, Can. VIII and Pontifical.*

The *Exorcist*, as the name imports, had to read the exorcisms or solemn adjurations of the church. These exorcisms are of three kinds, and directed against the evil spirits; 1st, concerning bodies which the devil has possessed; 2d, concerning souls subjected to the devil's empire by sin, and especially by original sin; 3d, concerning inanimate things, which evil spirits may use to the injury of men. It is the office of the Exorcist, 1st, by invocation of the name of God, by imposition of hands, and by the prescribed exorcisms of the church, to expel evil spirits from the bodies of the baptized and of Catechumens. 2d. To prepare the things necessary for the blessing of the lustral, or holy water. 3d. To assist the bishop or priest when performing exorcisms. 4th. To accompany the priest with the vase of holy water when he sprinkles the people with it. In ordaining the *Exorcist*, the bishop delivers to him the book, in which the exorcisms are written, or the missal or Pontifical, saying: "Receive and commit to memory, and have power to impose hands upon the possessed, whether they be baptized, or catechumens."—*Counc. Carth. IV, Can. 7.* In our times, exorcisms are reserved to the priests, and even these cannot use the first class of them, without special permission of the bishop, as natural infirmities might be taken for diabolical possessions, and the ceremonies of the church be subjected to the ridicule of her enemies.

The *Acolyte* is an officer appointed to assist the sub-deacon and deacon in the solemnity of the mass, to light and carry the candles, to answer at mass, to serve the wine and water, &c. The Bishop, in ordaining

him, presents him a candlestick with an unlighted candle in it, and says: "Receive the candlestick with the candle, that you may know you are to serve for inflaming the lights of the church, in the name of the Lord." He likewise delivers to him the plate with the empty cruets for the wine and water, saying: "Receive the little pitcher for bringing wine and water for the Eucharist of the blood of Christ, in the name of the Lord."—*Counc. Carth. IV, Can. 6.*

These orders, as named, conduct the candidate to *sub-deaconship*, which has been ranked among the greater, or sacred orders since the time of Pope Innocent III, in the end of the twelfth century, although, from the first ages of the church, it was also conferred, but commonly ranked among the minor orders. According to the declaration of Pope Eugene IV, in his decree to the Armenians, it is conferred "by the delivery to the candidate of the vacant chalice covered by the patena, likewise vacant, the bishop, saying to him: "See whose ministry is delivered to you, therefore I admonish you that you so conduct yourself, that you may be able to please God," and afterwards he says the prayer which follows in the Roman pontifical. The person ordained is required also to touch the little cruets, filled with wine and water, handed to him by the archdeacon; then the book of the epistles is presented to him by the bishop, who also invests him with the maniple and the tunic, saying the words corresponding as prescribed in the pontifical. The touching of the cruets, the presenting of the epistles, and the vesting are not considered to pertain to the essence of this sacred rite. The name *sub-deacon* indicates that he is to assist the deacon at the altar. It is his office to bring the chalice to the altar, and the wine and water, of which last he pours a small portion into the chalice before the offertory. He also chants the epistle; holds the patena elevated during the first part of the Lord's prayer; carries the kiss of peace to the choir; purifies and covers the chalice; carries the cross in proces-



sions; and attends to the washing of the purificatories and corporals, or sacred linens used for the sacrifice.

It is required by the church that those whom she promotes to the priesthood, should have received the first tonsure, and have passed through all these orders, before receiving the hierarchical orders. To *skip* any of them, is called an ordination *per saltum*. As they are independent, the order would be conferred, but the act is irregular; if a higher order be received before the lower, the person is suspended from the use of his order, and, the order omitted is required to be supplied before he will be permitted to act. If a person were ordained bishop, without having been ordained priest, his ordination by theologians is declared null, as *the priesthood is* indispensably necessary in the bishop, whether episcopacy be considered as its extension, or as a distinct sacrament. The church prohibits any ordination *per saltum*; but some canonists maintain, that the laws, imposing suspension and penalties on those thus ordained, are to be strictly interpreted concerning the sacred orders only, and not extended to the minor orders.

St. Thomas Aquinas gives the following reason for this division of orders. He says: "the distinction of orders is taken from their relation to the Eucharist, because the power of the order is given either to consecrate the body and blood of Jesus Christ, or to exercise some ministry which regards this consecration. The priesthood is established for this first function; and for this it is, that priests, in their ordination, receive the power to consecrate the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The functions of the other ministers regard either the body of Jesus Christ, or those, who are to receive it. The deacon, sub-deacon and acolyte, in some manner co-operate to the sacrament of the Eucharist, the deacon in distributing it, the sub-deacon in preparing, in the *sacred vases*, the matter which is to be changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the acolyte in preparing this matter in the vessels not consecrated. The other orders are instituted to prepare those who are to

receive the Eucharist, if they are impure or unclean; now persons can be so in three ways; some are infidels, who consequently are unworthy to assist at the celebration of the holy mysteries, and to be present in the assembly of the faithful, and it is the office of the door-keeper to remove them. Others are catechumens, who desire to be instructed that they may render themselves worthy to partake of the sacrament of our altars; the lectors are established to dispose them for this by their instructions. Finally, there are persons possessed, who cannot be admitted to holy communion; the exorcists have been instituted to deliver these from the evil spirit, that they may be capable to be received at the Holy Table."\*

*Of the Matter and Form of the Sacrament of Order.*

In conferring orders, the pontifical is to be followed, which presents both the matter and form. But as accidental omissions, or such as might be made arbitrarily, may take place, theologians discuss the question as to what is the *essential* matter and form of this sacrament, and differ from each other about it. Some consider the imposition of hands as the only *essential* matter for the deaconship, priesthood, and episcopacy; and the prayer which accompanies this ceremony, as the only sacramental form. Others add to this the presentation of the instruments, with which the sacred functions are to be performed, and the words used by the bishop in presenting them. Some say that as this presentation necessarily includes an imposition of hands, it is the essential act of the sacred rite.

As the scriptures plainly indicate, *the imposition of hands* for ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons; and as the fathers speak of the sacrament by this name of *imposition of hands*, it is certain that this rite, with the prayers or words corresponding, is essential. Indeed, the Council of Trent, declaring who is the minis-

---

\* St. Thom. suppl. 3 par. q. 37, A. 2.

ter of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, expressly says, that it is "bishops, or priests ordained by *the imposition of hands.*" Neither the scriptures, the councils, nor the fathers of the first ages, refer to the presentation of the instruments, and the Greek church, whose ordinations are admitted by the Catholic church, and in which orders are conferred by the rite of *imposition of hands*, does not employ the presentation of the instruments. Hence those, who consider the imposition of hands and the corresponding words as all that pertains to the essence, are most probably correct. The decree of Pope Eugene IV. to the Armenians, mentions the presentation of the instruments as the matter of the sacrament of order; but theologians state that the Pope was endeavouring to induce the orientals to adopt this rite in ordination, and therefore insisted on this particularly, being silent about "the imposition of hands," which was practiced alike by both churches, and also is found so clearly laid down in the Scriptures, that there was no question about it. Besides, he held, as is also done by all in the present time, that the rite, pertaining to the instruments, is an integral part of ordination. For the church has certainly received from Jesus Christ the power to determine what shall be used as pertaining to the integrity of the matter of the sacraments, though the matter thereof, at least in a general way, was indicated by the author of the sacraments, and the church does not claim to have the right to change what affects the substance of the matter.

A scrupulous attention to the observance of the rites prescribed for these ordinations, removes all danger of any practical difficulty regarding them.

For sub-deaconship and the minor orders, there can be no difficulty as respects the matter and form, if, as is commonly held, they are of ecclesiastical institution. In sub-deaconship, there is no imposition of hands, but a presentation of the empty chalice and patena, with the prescribed form of words. We have already seen how the minor orders and tonsure are conferred.

*Of the Effects of the Sacrament of Order.*

The effects of the sacrament of order are: 1st. Grace; 2dly. A mark or character; and 3dly. Power for performing the ecclesiastical offices appropriate to each order. And first, grace is bestowed. The Council of Trent settles this doctrine by declaring anathema against any one who denies "that the Holy Ghost is given by sacred ordination." In the first days of the church, the *charismata*, or graces for the benefit of others, as miracles, prophecy, the gift of tongues, &c., attended this sacrament as well as confirmation, but not as attached permanently to the rites, but, by the providence of God, given as long as needed to establish the church and to convert the world. But sanctifying grace was attached permanently to these rites; and, by the imposition of hands, the ordained receive grace to augment their holiness, and sacramental grace to render them more fitted to exercise the holy functions of their office. To this grace St. Paul referred, when, writing to Timothy, he tells him, as we have before cited, "to excite within himself the grace he had received by prophecy, and by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood." This grace, unless where an obstacle of some kind prevents, is, by ordination, made habitual in the soul, and gives a right to the ordained person to the actual graces necessary for the proper end of this sacrament; viz. for the observance of the clerical vow, for the keeping of the laws of the church, and for the worthy administration of the sacred functions. It is not instituted for conferring what is termed the *first* grace, in order to make a sinner just, but the *second* grace, to make one already just still more so, and yet it is held that it may, under certain circumstances, act in an extraordinary manner, and, as it is termed *per accidens*, sometimes confer the first grace. As, for instance, where a person was ordained in good faith, thinking himself in the state of grace, but really not so from some defect on his part, of which he was no longer conscious. Though



the sacrament of Order confers grace from the force of the rite administered, *ex opere operato*, yet the sacramental grace given, varies in degree according to the order conferred, and to the more or less perfect dispositions of the person ordained. The want of suitable dispositions may diminish, or altogether obstruct the access of the sacramental grace.

2d. *Of the Character.* In speaking of the sacraments in general, we have seen that three of them imprint a character on the soul. Of these three, Order is one. Like baptism and confirmation, it impresses upon the soul a certain spiritual and ineffaceable sign. This is of faith, as read in the Council of Trent. *Sess. VII. Can. IX. of the sacraments in general; and of order in particular, Session XXIII. Can. IV.* The fact, that the church has ever studiously refrained from the reiteration of orders, which were conferred by a valid rite and by one recognized as capable to administer orders, is evidence that this has always been the faith of the church. Even orders conferred by heretical, simoniacal, or schismatical bishops, are not reiterated for those converted to the unity of the church, as may be established from testimonies from St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Leo, St. Gregory the Great, and by decrees of councils, such as of Carthage, in 397; the general council of Ephesus, in 431; the third general council of Constantinople, in 680; and from papal decrees and constitutions. If clerical converts from the Anglican church, are ordained, it is because Anglican orders are not recognized as valid, since it is uncertain, whether Barlow, the consecrator of Archbishop Parker, from whom they all flow, ever was himself ordained bishop, and certain, that Parker, if ordained, was ordained with the ordinal of Edward VI., which is held to be an insufficient rite, and one which the church of England recognized to be insufficient, by changing it for another, and hence it has become an impossibility to establish the validity of Anglican ordinations.

The character or mark is conferred upon those rightly ordained, however bad their dispositions, if they

publicly present themselves, showing the intention to be ordained. Their dispositions being bad, will prevent their receiving the sacramental grace, but not the character, which associates them with the priesthood of Jesus Christ. They will be in mortal sin and most unworthy, but still forever marked with this sign upon the soul, as has ever been held in the church. Hence, as there is a prohibition to reiterate baptism and confirmation, so also is there a law against reiterating orders, and the church extends this prohibition to all the orders, minor as well as greater, and even to the ceremony of the first Tonsure, although those theologians, who do not admit sub-deaconship and the lesser orders to be really of the value of the sacrament of Order, restrict the sign and character to the three hierarchical ranks of episcopacy, priesthood, and deaconship. Yet, as the other orders carry with them a special consecration to certain sacred functions and fixed offices in the church, they are not allowed to be reiterated. The persons have consecrated themselves to God and to the service of the church, and the church, in ordaining them, has marked and designated them as permanently fitted to discharge the sacred functions annexed to each order, and while they live they remain thus capable, even though no sign be thereby fixed upon the soul, as takes place in those ranks which are recognized to be parts of the sacrament of order.

3d. *Of the Power conferred.* In holy order, for the priesthood, a third effect accompanies the character, and is usually considered as the same effect with it, this is a double spiritual power, first, to consecrate, offer, and distribute the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, and secondly, to remit and retain the sins of men; the first, having reference to the natural body of Jesus Christ, and the last to his mystic body, the church. The first is termed *the power of Order*, the last *the power of jurisdiction*.

Jurisdiction, in its general scope, regards the external government of the church, as well as the interior tribunal of conscience. The faithful are constituted

into a society, over which their pastors are placed to govern and direct them, and for their union laws are necessary, otherwise all would be disorder and confusion. They are commanded to obey their pastors, who are to watch over them, and to give an account of their souls.\* Hence to these pastors the power of Jurisdiction is indispensable. But the power of Order is equally necessary, because they can do nothing in the affair of salvation without Christ, who, in his eternal priesthood, has placed the altar of sacrifice in the midst of the people, and on it himself as the victim, of which they are to partake when offered to God for them; and therefore he has entrusted to those whom he has made his priests, power over his body and blood, that they may distribute them as food to nourish the souls of men, and make Christ live in them. The holy scriptures declare this twofold power. Tradition has continued to teach it, and the church to believe it.†

The power of Order was given to the Apostles, when Jesus Christ, at his last supper, said to them, "Do this for a commemoration of me." He then ordained them. After his resurrection, he conferred on them the power of jurisdiction, when breathing on them he said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."‡

In more general terms, conferring the power "to bind and loose on earth," and promising that the same should be ratified in heaven, and declaring them his representatives; "he who hears you, hears me," he constituted them rulers of his church; but by giving "the keys" to Peter only, he subjected all to one, and constituted the power of jurisdiction in unity of exercise, so that there should be "one household of the faith," "one sheepfold," "one church of God," and that all the extraordinary powers conferred, should be used for

---

\* Heb. xiii. 17.

† Coun, Trent. Sess. XXIII. Can. I.

‡ John xx, 22, 23.

the edification and prosperity of the "one body of Christ." Hence we are to understand :

First, that priests in their ordination, receive the power to consecrate the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and that this power is so proper to priests, that it belongs to bishops only because they are priests.

Secondly, that although priests, in their ordination, receive the power to remit sins, the priesthood does not properly give the power of jurisdiction, as to the right of exercising it, since there is needed an assignment of subjects for its exercise, which is to be made by the bishop.

Thirdly, that bishops in their consecration, receive a power of Order and a power of jurisdiction.

Fourthly, that the power of jurisdiction belongs primarily and originally to bishops, as having received it from the Holy Ghost, by whom they are placed over the flock of Jesus Christ to rule and govern it as vicars.\*

The bishops, who hold the first rank in the hierarchy, and are successors of the Apostles, receive the power of jurisdiction in an eminent manner, so as to be able to communicate it to priests, who are subordinate to them, and who receive this power indeed as it is contained in their character of priest, but not as it is to be exercised for the people, until the ruler of the flock, or chief pastor, has given them authority to do so, and assigned to them subjects, to whom they are to devote their ministry.

This is by all theologians recognized, whether they consider that episcopal ordination gives to the person ordained a character distinct from that of the priesthood, or think it only an extension and perfection of the same order, with extension of character and powers. They are required to believe that the power of Order is not the same in the priests and bishops, nor the power of jurisdiction the same, but that bishops possess these in a more eminent degree, and can perform func-

---

\* Acts xx : 28.



tions, for which the episcopal dignity is so essentially necessary, that priests can in no wise perform them validly.

*Of the Minister of the Sacrament of Order.*

It is of faith that bishops are superior to priests: that they have the power to administer confirmation and confer orders; and that this power is not common to them with priests, but belongs to them properly. The bishops then only are the ministers of Holy Order. This doctrine is sustained by the Holy Scriptures, in which we behold persons ordained only by the Apostles, or by such as the Apostles had ordained bishops. The Apostles imposed hands on the deacons. They also ordained Paul and Barnabas bishops. These in turn ordained priests in the churches. Paul ordained Timothy, as he declares himself. To Timothy and Titus, as bishops, he gave instructions regarding the choice of persons upon whom they should "impose hands" to ordain them as bishops, priests, and deacons. It is also clear, from the apostolical constitutions, from ancient councils, and from the fathers and doctors of the church in every age, and from the unvaried practice both of the Latin and Greek church, that only bishops are recognized as having the power to confer Holy Order for the three hierarchial ranks of Episcopacy, priesthood and deaconship. There is not the least doubt of this, and even those who during the first ages, for some heresy left the church, have shown their recognition of this faith, by endeavoring always to have their ministers ordained by those who were known to be bishops. And where attempts were made, by those not bishops, to confer these orders, the reclamation against such ordination was loud and general.

For sub-deaconship and the minor orders, the church has not, in all cases, required that the one ordaining should have the episcopal character. It is commonly held that the Pope can authorize a simple priest to con-

fer these orders. Yet it is the custom to receive them from bishops only.

*Of the Subject who is to Receive the Sacrament of Order—The Conditions Required.*

To expose all the qualities which the church desires to find in those associated to the priesthood, and all the regulations she has made to inspire reverence for their high dignity and its sacred offices, would require a volume. In speaking therefore of the subject, or person to receive this sacrament, we can only mention a few general points. This sacrament requires some conditions for its valid, and others for its licit administration.

1st. It is recognized that only men are the fit subjects for this sacrament.

2d. That women are, by divine law, held incapable to receive it.

3d. That for its validity a person must have been baptized.

4th. That he was not plainly and absolutely unwilling to be ordained. In the early period of the church, persons who had no thought to be ordained, were chosen by the people, and reluctantly suffered themselves to be ordained. They yielded to the anxiety and urgency of the people, and gave a passive consent, which was sufficient. The common opinion is that an ordination conferred on one absolutely unwilling would be null. Theologians have differed about the question, whether infants could receive this sacrament and would be validly ordained. Some say such ordination would be valid, others declare it null. Even if supposed valid as to the character, certainly, the obligations, which go with it for adults, could not be binding, as they were not freely assumed.\*

5th. Persons ordained must have the use of reason,

---

\* Benedict XIV: on the Coptic Rites.

hence those destitute of reason, or the inebriated, would not be ordained, as most commonly held.

For a licit ordination, the church by precept requires that the person shall have received confirmation, and this she even requires before the First Tonsure is given. She also requires the following conditions:

1. A *divine vocation*, as far as can be judged by the positive and negative signs thereof.

2. A *right intention*, and not merely worldly motives.

3. *Proved sanctity*, or the qualities as set forth by St. Paul as necessary for the deacon, priest, and bishop.

4. *Competent sciencè*, which is different for different orders.

5. *Legitimate age*, which is less for the First Tonsure and minor orders, but for sub-deaconship, the twenty-second year; for deaconship, the twenty-third; for priesthood the twenty-fifth; and for bishops the end of the thirtieth year of age.

6. A *becoming locality*, generally the cathedral church, though custom allows the bishop to use his own chapel, or some other church or chapel.

7. The *appointed time*, as the morning, and on Sundays or festivals of the double rank. The greater orders, by precept are to be conferred on the Saturday of the quarter tenses, or ember days, and during mass. The bishop, who ordains, is also to celebrate the mass for the lawfulness of the ordination, though the ordination would be valid if a different bishop celebrated. This law as to the time admits of dispensation. The Tonsure can be given at any time, hour, and place, as declared in the pontifical. Bishops are ordained on Sundays, or on the feast of an Apostle, and, by concession of the papal indult, on any festival day.

8. The *observance of the Interstices*, or intervals of time which by law should occur between the orders. For the minor orders it is not customary now to observe an interval, but commonly they are conferred on the same day. There is a strict law prohibiting from conferring or receiving on the same day two of the sacred orders, unless the utility and necessity of the

church demand it, when bishops have power to dispense with this law.

9. A *required title*, or the evidence that the person has sufficient provision for a decent support, according to the rank of his order. In the first days of the church, they were assigned to particular churches, which they had to serve, and thence to derive their support.

10. *An ordination by degrees, and not per saltum, or skipping.* Such an ordination, except in case of one ordained bishop without having been ordained priest, or the conferring of a particular order without the one preceding having been given, was held to be valid, because each order is independent, but it was not licit; and to give or receive them thus intentionally, is held a grievous sin; and the church inflicts penalties on the ordainer and ordained, and requires the omission to be supplied. To ordain any one bishop, who has not been ordained priest first, is to perform a null and invalid rite.

Lastly. *The church requires immunity from, what she terms, irregularities.* Irregularity is derived from *regula*, or rule, and that which is without rule, or against rule, is termed *irregular*. As her ministers have to edify the people by the regularity of their conduct, the church has enacted laws and prescribed rules for those who seek promotion to the orders of the ministry. She has deduced most of these rules from the epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, where he instructs them as to the qualities of the persons to be ordained. Irregularity is a canonical impediment, which renders a person unsuited to be promoted to orders, or to exercise the functions of them, if he have been already ordained. He is made unsuited for ordination, but not incapable of being ordained, by irregularity, and hence the irregularity does not annul the ordination. It is a prohibition by the church to receive or exercise orders. To be ordained, or to exercise the order already received, while under an irregularity, is held to be a mortal sin.



Irregularities are divided into two kinds, those arising from defect, and those coming from fault or crime. The defects which induce irregularity, are nine in number. 1st defect, of birth; 2d, of intellect; 3d, defect of the body; 4th, of age; 5th, of liberty; 6th, defect arising from obligation to the state or individuals, by way of indebtedness; 7th, defect of reputation; 8th, of bigamy;\* 9th, of meekness. With the exception of defect of reputation, any of them may be supposed to exist without fault.

The crimes which render a person irregular, in the present discipline of the church, are 1st. Heresy and Apostacy; 2d. Homicide and mutilation; 3. The violation of censures; 4th. The non-canonical reception of any sacred order; 5th. An illicit use of the functions of any order by those who have not received the orders; 6th. The reiteration of the sacrament of baptism; and, finally, all those things which, by law or in fact, make a person infamous. Let this suffice with respect to the sacrament of Holy Order. In the next chapter we shall consider a point in the discipline of the church, with respect to her ministers, in order to render them more worthy and efficient in the performance of their sacred functions.

---

## CHAPTER XXIII.

OF CELIBACY—IT IS AN OBLIGATION FOR THE CLERGY—  
IT IS A MORE EXCELLENT AND HOLY STATE THAN  
THAT OF MATRIMONY.

The church strictly requires from all whom she admits to sacred orders the vow of celibacy, and there-

---

\* Having been married *twice* is the bigamy referred to here. Simultaneous bigamy would be worse than an irregularity.

fore requires, from those who aspire to the priesthood, entire continence from the period of their initiation into the body of the clergy, by the first tonsure, and in their progress through the minor orders. But as it is possible for those in minor orders, to pass again into the life of the world, if they find they have no vocation, it is only when conferring the sub-deaconship, that the Church requires the vow, and imposes the obligation of celibacy. The vow is to be made freely, and no person is compelled to enter into orders, therefore none need complain of the law. That the state of celibacy is one more perfect than that of marriage is an article of faith. The Council of Trent declares: "If any one saith, that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity, or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or in celibacy, than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema."\* The words of our Saviour, in St. Matthew, show this doctrine: "There are eunuchs, who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven. He that can take, let him take it."† St. Paul teaches clearly that the state of virginity is better, and gives "the power to attend to the Lord, without impediment." He tells "the unmarried, that it is good for them if they so continue," even as he did himself. That the married are *divided* in their solicitude, while the unmarried can be "solicitous only for the things which belong to God and how to please God."‡ To him who leaves his wife for his sake, Jesus Christ promises eternal life, and of course, it is the same merit, *for his sake*, to refrain from marrying altogether.

Even the Pagans recognized that the state of virginity was a more holy state than marriage, and that it was one especially becoming in such as were consecrated, to the service of the altar. "It was," says de Maistre, "a common opinion among men of all times, of all places, of all religions, that there is in continence something celestial, which exalts man and renders him agree-

---

\* Sess. XXIV, Can. X. † Mat. xix: 12. ‡ 1 Cor. ch. vii.

able to the Divinity; that, as a necessary consequence, all sacerdotal functions, or religious acts and ceremonies, either but little or not at all accord with the marriage state."\* At Rome, the priestesses of Vesta were required to observe entire continence, and being designated from the age of six to ten years, were only allowed to marry after thirty years' service, on renouncing their functions, and even then their marriage was considered as a sort of sacrilege. The penalty of a violation of the law of virginity was to be interred alive, and it was the custom to offer yearly sacrifices of expiation upon their tombs. St. Jerome testifies to the esteem which Pagan nations had for this virtue, especially in its relation to sacerdotal functions,† although it must be admitted that they had little idea of chastity as a Christian virtue, which comprehends purity of thought and mind, as well as continence, but considered merely the material or external chastity of the body, Tibullus, in the first elegy of his second book, declares that "chastity is pleasing to the Gods." Cicero says that "the Gods are to be approached chastely," *Ad divos adeunto caste.*‡ "I am persuaded," says Demosthenes, that he, who enters the sanctuary, who touches sacred things, ought to be chaste, not only during a certain number of determined days, but during his whole life.§ The avowal of David regarding himself and the young men with him, before he was allowed to partake of the breads of proposition,|| and the fact that the priests, who, in their turn, performed the functions of the priesthood,¶ were required to live apart from their wives, prove that the value of this virtue, and its propriety for times and acts pertaining to the worship of God, had been taught to the Jewish people. From this St. Jerome, in his comments on the first chapter of the epistle to Titus, and Innocent I, in his third letter to Exuperius, argue that the priests of the new law

---

\* Du Pape, book LIV., ch. III, sec. 1st. † Cont. Jovinian, 1 lib. n. 41. ‡ De leg. lib. ii: 8. § Discourse against Timocrates. || 1 Kings xxi: 4, 5. ¶ 1 Paralip. xxiv. Luke i.

should observe perpetual chastity, because their ministry is without succession, and they daily consecrate, receive, and distribute the body of Jesus Christ, of which the breads of proposition were the figure.

Origen, speaking on this subject says: "It seems to me that, to offer the unceasing sacrifice belongs only to him, who has vowed himself to perpetual and unceasing chastity."\* And we have the testimony of St. Jerome and St. Epiphanius that, even from the first days of the church, it was studiously endeavoured to cause those who were promoted to holy orders, to give up cohabitation with their wives, as the church, in the beginning, because of the paucity of her members, had frequently to confer orders on men already married. St. Jerome, speaking of the church of the East, in which he dwelt during a greater part of his life, remarks that "they chose for bishops, priests, and deacons, either those who had never married, or who had lost their wives, or who, after receiving sacred orders, lived in continence."† St. Epiphanius is not less clear on the subject. "The church," says he, "never elevates to the order of deacon, priest, or bishop, nor even to that of sub-deacon, the one who lives in the marriage state, and desires to have a family; but only such as having one wife voluntary separate from her, or are deprived of her by death. This is especially practiced in places where the ecclesiastical canons are religiously observed."‡ The Council of Elvira, in the year 305, enjoins this under penalty of interdict from their functions.§ Pope Siricius, in a letter to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, declares the same obligatory on married men promoted to holy orders, and says, that, "from the time of ordination, *insolubile lege adstringimur*, we are held by an irrevocable law, to devote our hearts and bodies to temperance and chastity."|| This was written in the year 395, and not for the purpose of pro-

\* Hom. 23, on Numbers.

† Letter XXX, Cont Jovinian.

‡ Heres. LIX, § Can. XXXIII.

|| Cited by Labbe, Tom. II. Col.

1019.



posing some new legislation, but to call attention to the law, as already in force in the church of the West, which strictly enjoins celibacy on the clergy. In fact, the second council of Carthage, in 390, ordaining the same, declares that it was the teaching of the Apostles: "that we also may keep, what the Apostles have taught, and antiquity itself observed."\* The law has since been confirmed by councils in Africa, Spain and Gaul, and the Council of Trent declares anathema against "any one who saith, that clerics constituted in sacred orders, or Regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted it is valid, notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law or vow."†

In the Latin church, this was the discipline from the beginning, and it never was recognized as lawful for bishops, priests, and deacons, either to marry after ordination, or to cohabit with their wives whom they had espoused before ordination. At first, indeed the law did not include sub-deaconship, which was not numbered with the greater or sacred orders, before the time of Urban II., who occupied the chair of Peter from 1088 to 1099. We learn this from Innocent III.—who seems to represent Urban II. as the first who placed this order among the sacred orders. Innocent III., by allowing bishops to be elected from among sub-deacons, contributed greatly to give to it this rank. Yet Pope Sylvester, in the second council of Rome, binds sub-deacons to continence, prohibiting them to marry after ordination. There were some local and personal exceptions to the discipline, as respected deacons, from what appears in a decree of the synod of Ancyra,‡ At first, the discipline did not embrace a law annulling marriages entered into by those in sacred orders, but contained penalties, such as suspension from the ministry, and even deposition from the order. It is said by some, that Pope Calixtus II., elected in 1119, was the first, who, by a universal law, declared such marriages

---

\* II. Counc. Carthago. Can. II. † Sess. XXIV, Can. IX. ‡ See Labbe' Tom. I. p. 1459 D.

null, and required a separation. Others maintain that this was decreed, a little later, by Innocent II., who was elected in 1130. The church has since continued to regard such marriages, not only as sacrilegious, but as null and void. From time to time, she has called attention to the ancient rule handed down, and added new regulations for removing and preventing abuses, which would bring dishonor on so sacred a ministry.

The Greek and oriental churches insensibly relaxed from the rigor of the primitive discipline. In the beginning, they received the same discipline as to celibacy with the church of the West, for, as St. Clement declares, "this was a regulation of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles;" and the testimonies of Origen, St. Jerome, and St. Epiphanius, show that, up to their time, it had been the effort of the Greek church to procure the strict observance of this law. Nor did the Greek church, at any time, allow marriage to the clergy after receiving sacred orders, but held, and still holds such marriages as null. Besides in the first ages, she did not allow those, who had been ordained bishops and priests after being married, to live as before, but required continence. She departed from this discipline, about the time of the Council of Trullo, also called the *Quinisextian*, which permitted to priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, who were married before ordination, to remain with their wives, except at the period of their term of service in the sacred ministry, but did not allow the same privilege to bishops.

Though the Holy See has not approved several things enacted by this council, and could not be pleased with this innovation; we do not find that it, or the Council of Florence, has refused to tolerate the permission given by said council, as regards the priests of the Greek church; being doubtless unwilling to give rise to another obstacle to the re-union of the churches. Nevertheless, it has always been very firm, in spite of the greatest influence exerted at times to procure relaxation of the law of celibacy, in maintaining it strictly in the church of the West, and this firmness has continually

received the approbation of all among the clergy, who have appreciated the holiness and dignity of their state, and the priceless advantages, which religion and society have derived, from the existence of the present discipline, during all the ages of the church from the very days of the Apostles. The best testimonies of Tradition go to show that the Apostles, with the exception of St. Peter, were not married, and that St. Peter, as he declared to Christ, "left all things" for him, and of course his wife also. As far as they could, under the circumstances, they called only the unmarried to share in the ministry; and if they found themselves compelled to promote to this dignity married converts, they induced them to endeavour to fulfil the counsel, and imitate the example of their divine master, and, like St. Peter, to abandon all things for the sake of him, who wished them to be his ambassadors and ministers, and not only "to preach his gospel," but to exhibit it in their lives.

Those who neither love the Catholic church nor this particular discipline, object these words of St. Paul, where he speaks of the qualifications of bishops, saying: "It behooveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, *the husband of one wife,*"\* etc. They urge that this saying of the Apostle is against such a discipline. The church does not think so, and the decision of the dispute depends upon the intention of the Apostle. Did he intend a command and injunction that the bishop should have a wife? Why then had he none himself? And why advise others to remain single as he was himself? Or was his saying to be understood *negatively*, "do not take for bishop a man who has more wives than one, or a man that has been married more than once?" This is what the church has understood him to mean, and she is more likely to understand what the Apostle intended than those who differ from him in giving preference to marriage over celibacy, which he did not assuredly. That he meant what the church says, is plain

---

\* 1 Tim. iii: 2, and Tit. i: 6.

from his using the same expression in a similar sense, when he recommends that only widows should be selected for deaconesses, "who have been the wife of one husband."\* He thinks that she, who has been married more than once, though a widow again, is not fit to be chosen to serve in the church. The fact of having been married a *second time* seems to constitute an objection here, as in the case of those to be chosen for the ministry, for he uses the same expression with respect to deacons: "Let deacons be the husband of one wife;" that is, let them be free both from simultaneous, and successive bigamy. If they have only married once, they may be promoted, but not if they have had more than one wife. But he does not say they *shall* remain with that wife as before, for his divine master had promised eternal life to him who, for his sake, should leave his wife, † &c. And to prove that such was the meaning of the Apostle, we have only to call to mind that the early followers of Christ, and members of his church, could scarcely endure that Christians should marry a second time. Not only were they scandalized by such marriages, but the clergy in most parts were for a long time unwilling to impart the nuptial benediction to those who entered into them; and this both among the Greek and the Latins. Certain local councils even drew up penitential canons, subjecting such persons to periods of penance, and for a time withholding from them the holy communion, not as a prohibition of a crime, but as a prevention of scandal. The church indeed, never expressly condemned second or other successive marriages as invalid, holding them free and legitimate. St. Paul himself has allowed second marriages. But some of the fathers have used exaggerated terms to stigmatize them; and certain heretics, as the Montanists and Novatians, denounced them as invalid, and for this were condemned by the Council of Nice. The early Christians, however, had so exalted an idea of the superior excellence of virginity, that,

---

\* 1 Tim. v: 9. † Math. xix: 29.



while they believed marriage to be a holy state, and that it had the dignity of being a sacrament, they considered persons, who should marry a second time, not sufficiently spiritual, in not being able to aspire to what was more perfect, even when God, by taking away their partner, left them free to do so. Besides, esteeming marriage as a sign of the union of Jesus Christ with his church, they desired to see its dignity preserved by the holy conjugal union of two only, without a third party coming in succession. They knew also that second and other marriages are the fruitful cause of disorders, dissensions, and unhappiness in families. Undoubtedly, the teachings of St. Paul, in the passages in question, contributed to give to the first Christians these sentiments. At no period has it been understood in the church that the Apostle desired that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons should be married men.

But it is further objected, that St. Paul had a wife, because he says: "Have we not power to lead about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles,"\* &c. Again he says: "And I entreat thee also, my sincere companion, help those women who have laboured with me in the gospel."† They represent that this woman, a sister, was his "sincere companion," or wife. St. Jerome, who knew what the ancient church believed about the meaning of these passages, says: "The Apostle speaks of holy women, who according to the Jewish custom, ministered of their substance to the teachers, as we read they did to our Lord himself."‡ And the Apostle, who, in the seventh chapter of the same epistle to the Corinthians, declares himself to be *unmarried*, and is recommending to widows and single persons to remain single and unmarried as *choosing the better part*, and being better able to give God *undivided* service, is not likely to be talking, in the ninth chapter, about his having a wife, or his right to have one. He claims the right to have the aid of a sister in religion, in his labours to spread the gospel. And it is not even

---

\* 1 Cor. ix: 5. † Phil. iv: 3. ‡ St. Jer. lib. i. Cont. Jovinian.

certain that the "sincere companion," alluded to in the fourth chapter of the Philippians, was a female, as the Greek word for *associate* or *companion*, suffers either the masculine or feminine article, and might be translated either as a male or female companion, and both St. Chrysostom and Theophylactus represent that St. Paul most probably referred to the husband of one of the women, mentioned in the preceding verse, Evodia or Syntyche. But I fear I have already extended this chapter more than consistent with the space at my disposal for other matters, and therefore now conclude the subject.

---

## CHAPTER XXIV.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY—OF THE ENDS OF MATRIMONY—OF ITS NATURE—MATRIMONY IS A TRUE SACRAMENT—PROOFS OF THIS—OF THE MATTER, THE FORM, AND THE MINISTER OF THIS SACRAMENT—OF THE PROPERTIES OF MARRIAGE—ITS UNITY—ITS INDISSOLUBILITY, AND OF DIVORCE—OF THE MARRIAGES OF SLAVES—OF THE SUBJECT, OR OF THOSE WHO CONTRACT MARRIAGE—THE IMPEDIMENTS—OF THE POWER TO ESTABLISH IMPEDIMENTS—ANNULLING IMPEDIMENTS—PROHIBITIVE IMPEDIMENTS—OF THE DISPOSITIONS FOR RECEIVING THIS SACRAMENT.

### *Of the Ends of Matrimony.*

We have often had occasion to represent that it was the design and purpose, of the divine founder of Christianity, to restore men from their fallen condition, and to renovate them through the means of grace, and that for this end He established, endowed, and commissioned his church, and gave to her for the benefit of men His holy sacraments, each with reference to a particular in-

fluence and end, in harmony with the nature and wants of those for whom they were instituted. By Holy Order, He provided ministers to rule His church, and administer the sacraments. But there has always existed a divine institution, which is the source of human generations, and upon the condition of which the whole stream of human life is dependent. God when he instituted marriage, blessed it, and assigned its office. "And God blessed them, saying: increase and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it."\* God also indicated that, besides this chief end of marriage, which regards the offspring and the care and education necessary for them, it was needful for man to have a companion. "And the Lord God said: it is not good for man to be alone: let us make him a help like unto himself."† But though all living creatures passed before Adam, and he called all their names, the Scriptures tell us: "But for Adam there was not found a helper like himself."‡ "Then the Lord God cast a deep sleep upon Adam: and when he was fast asleep, he took one of his ribs, and filled up flesh for it. And the Lord God built the rib which he took from Adam into a woman; and brought her to Adam. And Adam said: This now is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh."§ A third end of marriage is indicated by the Apostle St. Paul.|| It is a preventive against sin. As God is the author of marriage, it is in its nature a holy institution. But in progress of time, it was grossly abused amongst the nations of the earth, the family society not having been maintained in its dignity, and

\* Gen. i: 28.

† Gen. ii: 18.

‡ Gen. ii: 20.

§ Gen. ii: 21, &c. From this text it is plain, that the name given by Adam to his companion, which in English is rendered woman, really signified *taken out of man*. The Latin uses the word *virago*, and the Hebrew *isschah*, which last means *taken from man*, while the other has become an English word, with the meaning of heroine, and also of termagant, or impudent female.

|| 1 Cor. vii: 2.

woman, having been degraded from her rank of companion to man, was no longer held to be his equal, but rather the slave of his passions, and hence, man no longer contented himself, like Adam, with one wife, and with forming that mysterious union of "two in one flesh," as Adam, under divine inspiration, had designated marriage, but he was accustomed, according to his caprices, to seek many wives, not merely successively, but even simultaneously. History presents an awful picture of the deplorable state of domestic society among the Pagans, and the consequent demoralization of all social institutions. Among the nations, adultery, infanticide, debauchery, divorce and other crimes were common. And even among the Jews, repudiation, with its consequent evil influence upon woman and her offspring, was tolerated and, after the period of the Roman subjugation, even frequent.

The Redeemer, in his great work of restoration, could not neglect giving his attention to this institution, upon which the individual man and general society are both entirely dependent, and hence he not only announced that, from the beginning, it was the work of God, but, in his church and among his followers, he elevated it to the dignity of a sacrament, and invested it with supernatural grace, that those who entered into this state, might be able to sanctify themselves, and bring up, in holiness and virtue, the children, who from their union should receive the gift of life. In the circle of the sacraments, Matrimony ranks as the last, but also touches the first, because it is the office of parents to present, at the fountain of regeneration, the fruits of a chaste and holy union, that those to whom they give existence as children of nature, may, by "water and the Holy Ghost," be born again children of God.

Although the church, instructed by Jesus Christ, esteems a state of celibacy, embraced for his sake, as more excellent and perfect than that of marriage, she it is, who, in pursuance of the purpose of the Saviour, has effected the restoration of marriage, by causing Christians to entertain for it the highest consideration



and esteem. In her effort thus to purify the domestic society, she has conferred upon humanity incalculable blessings. For she has continued to teach, that marriage is not only holy as an institution of God, but incalculably more holy as a sacrament of Jesus Christ, and that persons should choose it from holy motives, and for a holy end. Hence, for the descendants of those, who, with a pretence to make a reformation, have once more *degraded marriage*, by despoiling it of its sacramental dignity, to bring forward a groundless accusation against the church, as if, by preferring the state of virginity, she is guilty of "forbidding marriage," and consequently has inherited the predicted reproach of the Apostle as having abandoned the faith,\* is evidently a thing most absurd and calumnious. It is the church, who has maintained the value and sanctity of marriage, and secured its purity as the necessary basis of the whole social edifice, while, those, who reproach her, have actually themselves succeeded to degrade and pervert it, by representing it, even among Christians, as no more than a natural and civil contract, and permitting men easily to dissolve its tie or bond, against the declaration of Jesus Christ, that it is God who joined the parties together in this society, and that man cannot sever it,† and against the express teaching of the church, that a Christian marriage, validly contracted and consummated, can only be dissolved by death.

### *Of the Nature of Matrimony.*

The term Matrimony, better than the word marriage, shows the nature of this institution, for as the Catechism of the Council of Trent represents; "It is called 'matrimony,' because the principal object which a female should propose to herself, in marriage, is to become a mother." It signifies the office of mother, *matris munus*, because it belongs to her to bring forth and train up her offspring. It is called *wedlock* (*conjugium*,

---

\* 1 Tim. iv: 3. † Math, xix: 6.

the common yoke) from the conjugal union of man and wife. And it is termed *nuptials*, (*nuptiæ*) from the veil, which through modesty should cover the face of the bride, and which is held to signify subjection to the husband.

Marriage may be considered in a threefold light; 1st. as an office of nature; 2ndly, as a civil contract; and 3dly, as a sacrament. As an office of nature, it is ordained for the procreation and conservation of the human race. As a civil contract, it consults the peace and continuance of the community and republic. As a sacrament, it ornaments the parties with grace, and enriches the church with a pious and faithful progeny.

Considered as an office of nature, it is a natural contract, and is defined thus: "The conjugal and legitimate union of man and woman, which is to last during life." Thus, after the Justinian code, does the Roman Catechism represent it. But even as a natural contract, resulting from the internal consent of the parties, externally expressed, and granting to each other respectively, dominion over the persons, for the end of the union, it does not afterwards depend merely upon the will of the parties, but upon the will and law of God, who is really the author of it, and who, as the scriptures show us, has subjected it to specified and imperious conditions. The false and foolish things, which many pretended philosophers have written about marriage, are predicated upon a misconception of its origin and nature. From what has been already cited from Genesis, we see: 1st, that marriage is the society of two persons; of one man and one woman, and therefore incompatible with polygamy. 2dly. It is a free and voluntary contract, in which there is to be a union of minds, of hearts and persons. 3dly. According to its nature and end, it is to be an indissoluble society as far as the power of man is concerned, since the married "are two in one flesh," and it is not possible for a man to separate from himself, although "to God all things are possible," and it is only in his right and power to dissolve the bond of this society. 4thly. The effect of this is to

give to each a right over the person of the other, equal to what a man has over himself. 5thly. The end for which this society is formed is the peopling of the earth by the birth of children, whom the parents are therefore obliged to watch over, to nourish, and to rear according to their need for the conservation of body and soul, and consequently to educate them properly. 6th. To this society God gives his benediction, and he makes the prosperity of families and the welfare of general society depend on it. To the inviolability of this contract, is the woman particularly indebted for some kind of compensation for the greater burden imposed upon her in respect to the children, for, by it, is the father held to the fulfilment of his duties towards them, and, by its sacred and indissoluble character, prevented from escaping the responsibility, as is often done by men who contemn the laws of God. In deciding, therefore, upon what is opposed or conformed to the nature of this society, the interests of the offspring must be considered, as well as the interests of the parties themselves, and the fact must always be remembered, that the contract voluntarily made by the parties, is, by the will of God, constituted a tie or bond, which men have no right to sever. But the heads of society, or civil rulers, have always considered it a right to exercise supervision, over persons subject to their rule, as respects this contract. By laws, they regulate the rights of fathers, mothers, and children, and the possession and inheritance of property or goods pertaining to families, and even as to the civil effects, declare who shall be fit and who unfit to enter into the marriage contract. Hence marriage is said to be not only a natural, but also a civil contract. It is manifest, however, that it would be a mere abuse and not a right, in the civil authority to enact any law which should conflict with the natural and divine law respecting marriage, or contrary to the great interests which God intends to secure by this institution. Hence the civil government can make no law which will annul the natural contract and the sacrament of Jesus Christ, and can only properly interfere

with the civil effects and relations of marriage, in its legislation.

If it be asked, in what consists the nature or essence of marriage, as a natural and civil contract? we answer with the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and theologians commonly, that "although a perfect marriage has all these conditions, viz: internal consent, external assent expressed by words, the obligation and tie which arise from the contract, and the marriage debt by which it is consummated; yet the obligation and tie, expressed by the word 'union,' alone have the force and nature of marriage."\* "Hence, it is evident, that in that tie consists marriage. Some eminent divines, it is true, say that it consists in the consent, as when they define it: 'The consent of the man and woman;' but we are to understand them to mean that the consent is the efficient cause of marriage, which is the doctrine of the Fathers of the Council of Florence; because without the consent and contract, the obligation and tie cannot possibly exist. But it is of absolute necessity that the consent be expressed in words which designate the present time."† Words which signify a marriage in future time, can only have the value of a promise or betrothal, but such a promise of marriage, with the due qualities of sincere, mutual, and free, is obligatory, and cannot be violated without a breach of faith. Though this consent in the contract should be expressed in words generally, yet it may be otherwise expressed, as by a nod or some unequivocal sign, or even by silence, when it is the result of female modesty, the parents responding for their daughter, and such a consent may form a valid marriage. To induce the existence of the tie and obligation, and make a true marriage, the consummation of it is not necessary.

*Matrimony is a true Sacrament—Proofs of this.*

The Saviour, in forbidding the abuses which had oc-

\* Cat. Coun. Trent, on the Sac. Matrim. quest. IV.

† Cat. Coun. Trent, on the Sac. Matrim. quest. V.



cured, and restoring marriage to its primitive condition as instituted by God, also elevated it to the rank and dignity of a sacrament. Marriage, as a sacrament, may be thus defined: In the new law, matrimony is a sacrament instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, which, to those who receive it worthily, gives grace to sanctify them in their state, to bring up their children in a Christian manner, and which represents the Union of Jesus Christ with his church. That it is a true sacrament, is a doctrine of faith, as may be seen from the Council of Trent:

“If any one saith, that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law (a sacrament) instituted by Christ the Lord; but that it has been invented by men in the church; and that it does not confer grace; let him be anathema.”\*

And the same council says: “But, the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited for us by His passion; as the Apostle Paul intimates, saying: ‘Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself for it;’ adding shortly after, ‘This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.’ (Ephes. v. 25. 32.) Whereas, therefore matrimony, in the evangelical law, excels in grace, through Christ, the ancient marriages; with reason have our holy Fathers, the Councils, and the tradition of the universal church, always taught that it is to be numbered among the sacraments of the new law.”†

Christian Matrimony has all that can be required to constitute a sacrament. 1st. As a sensible sign, or external rite, the internal consent being expressed by words, or equivalent signs. 2dly. As a sign giving, sanctifying grace; 3dly. As being by Christ chosen and appointed for conferring grace.

---

\* Counc. Trent. Sess. XXIV. Can. I.

† Sess. XXIV. In commencement.

1. That it is an outward sensible sign, needs no proof.

2. The words of the Apostle prove that it is the sign of a *sacred* thing, or a sign which gives grace. For after announcing thus the intimate union of those who enter into marriage: "For this shall a man leave his father and mother; and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be *two in one flesh*," he immediately adds: "This is a great sacrament: But I speak in Christ and in the church."\* The Apostle is endeavouring to impress, upon the Christians of Ephesus, a correct idea of the nature of marriage and of its duties, and compares the conjugal union to the union of Jesus Christ with his church, giving them to know that this union is the model and type of the matrimonial union. The Apostle does not refer merely to the natural union, of the *Word of God*, with the human nature effected in the mystery of the Incarnation, but also to the spiritual union, effected by grace and charity, in which Christ espouses his church, cleanses, and purifies the members of his church, and attaches them to Himself. Jesus Christ makes the church his spouse, by the tie and bond of grace and love, and therefore matrimony signifies also that ineffable mystic union, which, in its perfection, is found in the communion, when the members of the church, by the holy Eucharist, are made one body, one flesh, one bone, with Jesus Christ, as remarked by several writers among the early Christians. The more recent Commentator, Estius, has the following remark: "By this, that a man, having left his parents, adheres to his wife, and is made one flesh with her, is mystically signified, that the Son of God descended to earth from the bosom of his Father, as if having left him, that he might be united to the church, and by the Incarnation be made one body with her."† The natural marriage then is chosen to be the symbol, sign, and image of the mystic marriage of Jesus Christ with his church, or with hu-

---

\* Ephes. v. 32. † In IV. dist. 26 § 5.

man nature regenerated and sanctified. The Apostle says: "Husbands love your wives as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it: that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.\* But such a union as this, of Christ with his church, cannot properly and perfectly be signified by a mere natural marriage, but only by a marriage "in Christ and in the church," which is itself a mystery or sacrament, and is enriched and enobled by the grace of God. There must be a spiritual union of souls, a holy bond of charity, after the example of the intimate and unchangeable love of Christ for his church, to make a marriage a fit and perfect sign or symbol of the mystic marriage of Jesus Christ. Husbands must "love their wives as Christ does the church," and "as the church is subject to Christ, so let wives be to their husbands in all things."† Consequently, in such a marriage, which is a religious and sacred sign, grace must be bestowed in order to perfect and elevate natural love and sanctify the parties, since "the husband is the head of the wife: as Christ is the head of the church,"‡ and as Christ is the head of the church through grace and love, and cherishes her with the most holy, pure and unalterable affection, so must the husband be head, not merely by a natural contract or from natural love, but by means of a more sacred and inviolable tie, which, being a religious mystery, is blessed with the power to give the necessary sacramental grace.

Other texts of the scriptures indicate that grace is annexed to matrimony among Christians. When St. Paul says: "Wives be subject to your husbands, as it behoveth in the Lord,"§ or as is *becoming* in the Lord, he evidently enjoins upon them a conduct especially required from them as Christian wives. Maldonatus remarks: "This phrase in the Greek has this sense: as

---

\* Ephes. v. 25, &c. † Ibid v. 24. ‡ Ibid 23. § Col. iii. 18.

becomes women, who have contracted marriage, not as do the Pagans, but in the Lord, that is, with due ceremony, holily, sacramentally."\* Writing to Timothy, the same Apostle declares, that "the woman *shall be saved* through child-bearing: if she continue in faith, and love, and sanctification with sobriety."† He gives this assurance to the Christian wife, who, persevering in faith, fulfils her duty as mother, bringing up her children for God, and thereby he insinuates that grace is attached to the bond and state of marriage. The holy and strict union required from Christians, that their marriage may be a sign of the union of Jesus Christ with his church, requires the assistance of God's grace, which is therefore given to them; for "every one," writes St. Paul, "hath his *proper gift* from God; one after this manner, another after that,"‡ and as he declares this while speaking of the two states of life, that of celibacy and that of marriage, we must conclude that married persons have their "proper gift" or grace, especially as he says: "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband, otherwise your children should be unclean; now they are holy."§ What is the proper gift of the married, if they have not that of grace to render their union holy, and how can the children be termed holy in any other sense, but because they are the fruit of a union that is holy?

The church and the fathers are very clear and express in setting forth the doctrine that, in the religion of Jesus Christ, marriage is a true sacrament.

3. But that matrimony should be a sign of a sacred thing, or a sensible sign giving grace, can only have resulted from the will of Jesus Christ, who elevated it to this dignity. He therefore instituted the sacrament of Matrimony. It is commonly believed, that he gave to it this dignity, when, by his presence, he honoured the marriage of Cana in Gallilee, as St. Epiphanius,

---

\* Mald. V. Cap. IV. Sentent. p. 428. † 1. Tim. ii. 15. ‡ 1. Cor. vii. 7. § Ibid, vii. 14.



Hæc. 67, St. Maximus, Hom. 1, in Epiph., St. Augustine, tract 9, in Joan, St. Cyril, Ep. ad Nestor. also represent this to be their opinion.

Those marriages, which are contracted between members of the church, in accordance with her laws and ceremonies, are assuredly sacramental. Unbaptized persons, when married, make only a natural and civil contract, and if they should be converted to the faith and received into the church, their marriage is valid, even although it is not a sacrament; but the probable opinion is that it may become a sacrament by the renewal of their consent.

It is the more common opinion, that a marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptized person, with the required dispensation from the impediment of *disparity of religion*, is not properly a sacrament for the Catholic party, the contract being between two the sacrament ought to be also in two, but one of them, the unbaptized person, is not capable of the sacrament, because not baptized; they can then only make a natural and civil contract, but not a sacramental one, yet some theologians affirm that the baptized party does receive the grace of the sacrament. The church, however, only tolerates, and does not approve such marriages. The dispensation is given with necessary precautions against the peril of perversion from the faith. And as it is not only doubtful whether the Catholic party receives sacramental grace, in a union of marriage with an unbaptized person, but even probable that he does not, those who care for the salvation of their souls and for eternal beatitude, will hesitate to form such alliances. Such marriages, without a dispensation, are null by ecclesiastical law, based most probably on the natural law.

The marriage of a Catholic with a non-Catholic who is baptized is *unlawful*, without a dispensation, but it would be *valid* and binding, when legitimately contracted, if no other impediment be in the way. Yet, in such marriages, there is always some danger for the faith and salvation of the Catholic, and for the salvation of the offspring, and a probability of discord because

of difference of religion. "How," asks St. Ambrose, "can charity coalesce if faith be discordant? Reason teaches, but oftener examples affect us more. Often have the wiles of women deceived the firmest husbands, and caused them to abandon their religion; and therefore either do you take care of your love, or beware of error. In marriage then, the first requisite is religion."\*

Some theologians have entertained a doubt whether a marriage entered into by proxy is a sacrament. But the common opinion appears to be that such contracts may not only be true and legitimate marriages, but even sacraments, if all required conditions have been complied with. Many royal and princely marriages have been made in this manner. It does not appear that the law of the church, which for a marriage requires the consent of the parties in words in the present, has required physical presence and consent, and therefore a presence and consent, by a legitimately authorized proxy, will suffice.

#### *Of the Matter, Form, and Minister of Matrimony.*

We do not find that the church has any where expressly defined, what are the precise matter and form of this sacrament, or who is to be held as the minister, and therefore theologians, in their disquisitions on the subject, have gone into different opinions. It is certain, that in marriage, the sacrament cannot exist without the contract, which is the basis and foundation of the sacrament. For the sacrament of marriage, therefore, it is indispensable that the parties should be capable of making the contract, and that this contract should possess the conditions required for the validity of contracts. The essence of the contract is the consent of those who make it, which must not be fictitious but real, which must be interior and manifested exteriorly, reciprocal, and given freely on both sides. But

---

\* St. Amb. lib. 2 de Abraham. Cap. IX.

even a legitimate contract, which may suffice for a true legitimate marriage is not enough for the sacrament of matrimony, because the parties must be baptized persons to be capable of receiving the sacrament. Among the unbaptized, as Jews and Pagans, marriage may be valid as a contract, and yet it is not a sacrament, unless in an improper and restricted sense, as a mere sign of the union of Jesus Christ with the human nature, but not as a sign which confers grace. Some have asked whether in Christian marriages, contracted by baptized persons, the matrimony can be valid as a contract, and not at the same time be a sacrament? Vasquez, Sylvius, and other theologians, have defended the opinion that such marriages might be valid merely as a contract without being a sacrament. But in his Encyclical, of the 27th September, 1852, Pope Pius IX, noticing the evils afflicting the church in New Granada, because of certain measures of those who were in power there, decides against this opinion. He says: "We say nothing concerning that other decree, by which, the mystery of the sacrament of marriage, its dignity and sanctity altogether despised, its institution and nature utterly ignored and subverted, and the power of the church over the same sacrament contemned, it was proposed, according to the already condemned errors of heretics, and contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic church, that matrimony should be held as only a civil contract, and in various cases divorce properly so called should be sanctioned, and all matrimonial causes placed under the jurisdiction of the lay tribunals, and be judged by them; when no Catholic is ignorant, or can be ignorant, that matrimony is one of the seven sacraments instituted by Christ the Lord, and, therefore, that *among the faithful there cannot be matrimony without its being at the same time a sacrament*, and consequently any other conjunction of man and woman among Christians, except the sacrament, and even made by the force of whatever civil law, is nothing else than a shameful and ruinous concubinage so earnestly condemned by the church, and hence, the sacrament can

never be separated from the conjugal tie, and it entirely belongs to the power of the church to determine all those things, which can in any manner pertain to the same matrimony." From this declaration of the Holy Father it may be concluded, that true and legitimate marriages between baptized persons not of the church, are also sacraments, when no other impediment exists to render such marriages null. The fact, that those converted to the church are not required to make a renewal of their consent, when they had, before their conversion, validly contracted matrimony, is in accordance with this conclusion.

The greatest number of theologians are of opinion that the legitimate contract between the parties to a marriage expressed in the present, at the same time includes both the *matter* and the *form* of this sacrament, although they do not all explain this in the same way. Some represent that the matter is found, in the tradition of power over each other which the two parties mutually give, and the form, in the mutual acceptance of this power which they make; while others represent that the matter consists in the words expressing the contract considered as a sign addressed to the senses, and the form in the words of the contract considered in their meaning, or the words expressing the tradition of power as matter, and the words expressing the acceptance as form. Those who entertain these opinions, which place the matter and form in the contract, also consider that the contracting parties are the true ministers of this sacrament, because they believe that matrimony was constituted a sacrament, by the Saviour elevating the true legitimate union of man and woman, as it was designed by God in the beginning, to the dignity of a sacrament in his church, by attaching to this union a particular grace, which it did not before possess, a grace, which sanctifies the natural love of the parties and the parties themselves.

The Council of Florence identifies the contract with the sacrament in Christian marriages, and appears to justify the belief that the parties contracting are the



ministers: It says: "The seventh is the sacrament of Matrimony, which according to the Apostle is the sign of the conjunction of Christ with the church; the efficient cause of matrimony regularly is the mutual consent expressed by words in the present."\*

Other theologians, and many of whom are of great reputation, following the views first put forward by the distinguished theologian, Melchior Cano, maintain that the priest is the proper minister of this sacrament as of other sacraments, and that the matter thereof is in the contract, ; and the form in the benediction given by the priest, who, in officiating uses the words: *Ego conjungo vos, &c.* "I conjoin you in matrimony in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." But as the Council of Trent admits that "other words, according to the received rite of each province," may be used, and does not declare these particular words to be essential, no conclusive argument can be deduced from them in favour of this opinion. The advocates of the opinion that the priest is the minister, bring forward many reasons of a certain value, but none which can prevail to set aside the more common sentiment which we have before exposed, and which also appears to have been the view held at all times in the church, before the days of Cano. The decision of the Pope that, in Christian marriages, the contract cannot be separated from the sacrament, is also a solid support to this opinion, and must greatly puzzle the advocates of the other, if not render it altogether indefensible.

To the faithful generally, this question can be of but little practical importance, except in very extraordinary circumstances, however much it may interest theologians, because it is certain that wherever the decree of the Council of Trent concerning clandestine marriages has been published as required in the decree, and wherever it is in force, the presence of the pastor, or of a priest properly delegated by the bishop or pastor, and

---

\* In Decreto, § Septim.

of two or three witnesses, is indispensably necessary to render a marriage valid. The council declares the parties incapable of contracting marriage, and pronounces the contract null and invalid, without this requirement shall have been complied with. It is also certain, and even is very evident from the fact of the church making this decree, that even where the said decree has not been published, it is the desire and intention of the church that Christian marriages should take place in the manner required in the decree, and that if this be not done, such marriages are unlawful and highly criminal, though they be not therefore invalid. But if they are criminal, those thus marrying do not receive grace, but commit a sacrilege. For the preventing of imprudent and sinful marriages, or such as are contracted without consent of parents, which marriages, the Council says, "the church has always detested and prohibited," it has made this decree, requiring a proclamation of bans, for three consecutive Sundays or festival days, during the solemnization of mass, and also the presence of the pastor, or an authorized priest with two or three witnesses. But from the first days of the church, it has always been the usage for the priest or the bishop to intervene at the marriages of the faithful, and with the prescribed rites and prayers to bestow the benediction of the church upon them.

The celebrated commentator on English law, Blackstone, on the incorrect authority of Moore, to whom he refers, states, in the first volume of his Commentaries, p. 440, that "the intervention of a priest to solemnize this contract (marriage) is merely *juris positivi*, and not *juris naturalis aut divini*: it being said that Pope Innocent III. was the first to ordain the celebration of marriage in the church; before which it was totally a civil contract." The falsehood of this last assertion that it was only a civil contract, is apparent from what we have already proved, viz: that matrimony was made a "great sacrament in Christ and in the church," and also is apparent from the fact that it has been continually from the beginning maintained to be a sacrament,

not only in the Western or Latin church, but among the Greeks as well, and even among all the oriental sects who had separated from the church in the East, except by those heretics who erred concerning marriage, as foretold by St. Paul. It is also false to represent that "the intervention of the priest to solemnize marriage" began under Pope Innocent III, since the action of the fourth Council of Lateran and of Pope Innocent III, chiefly regarded "the publication of bans," against secret marriages. "In the progress of time," says Chardon, in his history of the sacraments, "the church having thought proper, under pain of nullity, to prohibit marriage to certain persons in the Latin church; a custom prevailed of announcing at the Parochial mass, the future marriages of Christians, in order to discover if the parties were subject to any of the canonical prohibitions. This custom, which does not appear to have been ever in use in the Greek church, was received and observed in different provinces of Europe. Cujas says that it was one of very common observance in England. Innocent III. recognized that it was thus practiced in the diocese of Beauvais, in France. We find vestiges of it in the synodal ordinances of Eudes de Sulli, bishop of Paris, towards the end of the twelfth century. This custom of France and England was found so wise, and so prudently established, that it was approved by Pope Innocent III. in the fourth Council of Lateran in 1215.\* This Pope, by a general law, caused it to be extended to the whole Latin church, since which time all the faithful were obliged to observe it in the West. It was ordained in this assembly that pastors should, in the church, publish the future marriages of their parishioners, but the days and number of times for such publications were not specified."† This seems to be sufficient to give an insight into the cause of Blackstone's incorrect assertion; either he or Moore did not carefully examine the action of the Council of Lateran. The fact that even the

---

\* Cum in Tua. † Hist. Des Sacraments. Mar. ch. 2d, Art. I.

promise of marriage, the *betrothal*, was itself, in the early days of Christianity, a religious ceremony disproves his assertions. This ceremony was generally followed by a contract consigned to what was termed *matrimonial tables*, and which contained the conditions under which the parties reciprocally engaged themselves, and also the conditions on which parents gave their consent, the parties and assistants signed these tables, and the bishop as the common father of the faithful subscribed his name and approbation, "*istis tabulis subscripsit episcopus*," says St. Augustine. The writer of *Les Conférences d'Angers* tells us, that when persons were about to be married, they went to ask the benediction of the church, upon this contract, from the earliest days of Christianity. "The men applied to the deacons, the women to the deaconesses, in order to propose their marriage to the bishop, and know if he would approve them." It is his opinion, that to these mediators of marriage it was, that Tertullian refers when he speaks of the *consiliarii nuptiarum*.

St. Ignatius, Martyr, and a disciple of St. Polycarp, declares: "It is proper for men and women who marry, to enter into this alliance according to the judgment of the bishop, to the end that marriage may be according to the Lord, and may not proceed from the principle of cupidity." Tertullian, in his second book addressed to his wife, develops the discipline of the church on this subject, saying that the marriage is happy which is made by the mediation of the church. "Happy marriage, which the church joins together, which the oblation confirms, and being sealed the angels proclaim." His stating that the "oblation confirms marriage" proves the custom to offer the holy sacrifice on the occasion of marriage, or that the parties were united at the mass, and that the faithful then made their offerings. This Father even seems to go so far as to declare that they were in peril of being judged as sinful, and not nuptials, *unless first professed before the church*.

The Fathers often mention the nuptial benediction



as a rite of religion. Pope Siricius, in his decretal to Himerius (cited by Chardon), uses these words: "It is a sacrilege among Christians, by any transgression to violate that benediction, which she, who marries, receives from the priest."

St. Ambrose, in Ep. LXX, says that marriage ought to be sanctified by the sacerdotal benediction. The fourth Council of Carthage makes regulations regarding marriage. Ives of Chartres, and Gratian, refer to a decree of Pope Hormisdas, forbidding secret marriages.

In a manuscript of the year 900, from the monastery of Gellonius, which contains the missal of Pope Gelasius, may be seen the prayers usually said at the celebration of marriages. It was so customary for the minister of religion to intervene at marriages, both in the Eastern and Western church, that clandestine marriages contracted, without the sacerdotal benediction, in the esteem of many were considered null. Leo, the Philosopher, Alexis Commenes, and Basil the Macedonian, all enacted laws setting forth the necessity, for all persons entering into the marriage contract, to procure the benediction of the priest. The kings of France made similar laws.

Some began to grow remiss in applying for the religious rites of marriage, because of the answer which Pope Nicholas the First gave to the Bulgarians, saying, after mentioning the rites, "But we do not say that it is a sin if all these things are not found to intervene in the nuptial bond." Certain persons relied on this as authority for deciding that "the consent of parents and the sacerdotal benediction" were not necessary, and consequently that marriages without these, called *clandestine marriages*, were valid. The fourth Council of Lateran desired to repress this abuse of secret marriages, and therefore passed the law to which we have before referred.

But although Pope Nicholas declared that *all* the matrimonial rites, *hæc cuncta*, are not required to be observed under penalty of sin, he certainly did not in-

tend to represent that the intervention of the priest might be dispensed with, as there had been no decision as to who is minister of this sacrament, and moreover in his said reply to the Bulgarians, he writes thus concerning the usage of those who get married: "They conduct them to the church with the offerings which they make to the Lord, by the hands of the priest, and also receive the benediction and the celestial veil. . . . After this, having gone out of the church, they carry on their heads crowns, which it is the custom to reserve in the church." The same thing is evident from the ancient rituals and sacramentaries, in which are found prayers and ceremonies for the celebration of Christian marriages, which were, in all parts of christendom, consecrated by religion, as at all times the church and her members believed marriage to be a sacrament.

### *The Properties of Marriage.*

We shall briefly call attention to two chief properties of marriage, viz: its unity, and its indissolubility.

### *Of the Unity of Marriage.*

By the unity of marriage is signified that it is the society of one man and one woman. This unity may be opposed in two ways, either by successive, or by simultaneous polyandry or polygamy. For polyandry, strictly considered, even the Pagans had a horror, and certainly at no time has it been tolerated, at least among those who called themselves Christians, as a thing lawful for a woman to have a plurality of husbands at the same time. As to that polyandry which is successive, women have possessed the same privilege as have men for successive polygamy: The belief of Christians, that marriage is the sign of the alliance of Christ with his church, caused them, in the first ages, to regard second and other nuptials with disapprobation, and, in parts of the church, penances were imposed upon those who formed such marriages. Certain here-

tics, as the Montanists and Novatians, taught that they are sinful. But the church never declared them unlawful, since the Apostle St. Paul expressly allows them.\* The Council of Nice required from those Novatians, who were admitted back into the church, to promise that they would commune with such as had entered into second marriages, proving that the church considered them lawful.† And Pope Eugène IV, and the Council of Florence say: “We declare that not only second marriages are lawful, but even third, fourth, and ulterior marriages can be licitly contracted, if no impediment prevents.”

Simultaneous polygamy under the religion of the gospel is forbidden by the divine law. This is of Faith. The Council of Trent declares: “If any one saith, that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time, and that this is not prohibited by any divine law; let him be anathema.”‡ This declaration is sustained by the words of our Saviour, as reported in the gospel of St. Mathew, where, in answer to the question of the Pharisees: “Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause,” he replied: “Have you not read that he who made man from the beginning *made them male and female?* And he said: *for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh.*”§ Thus does the Saviour recall marriage to its primitive design, as the conjunction of one man and one woman, for it is *two*, and not more, who, by God’s will, are constituted one flesh. This is also well expressed in the declaration of the fathers of Trent: “But, that by this bond two only are united and joined together, our Lord taught more plainly, when rehearsing those last words as having been uttered by God, He said, *therefore now they are not two, but one flesh.*”|| The transfer of right, as set forth by St. Paul, in 1 Cor. vii, also shows

---

\* Rom. vii. 1 Cor. vii: 39, et ibid, 8, 9. † Counc. Nicæn. I Can. VIII. ‡ Counc. Trent. Sess, XXIV. Can. II. § Math. xix 3, 4, 5. || Sess. XXIV. on the Doc. of the Sac. of Matrimony.

the necessity of this unity, because to each is given the whole right over the other, and no third party can come in without a violation of justice. "It is not lawful for thee," writes St. Ambrose, "to marry another while your wife is living; to seek another while you have your own is the crime of adultery."\* St. Jerome commenting on the nineteenth chapter of St. Mathew, says a husband cannot dismiss an adulterous wife except on the condition of "not having another while the first is living."† "To leave a barren wife, to marry one who is prolific, is wicked, and if any one shall do so... by the law of the gospel, he is guilty of adultery."‡ Pope Nicholas I. says: "Neither does the origin itself of the human condition allow, nor any law of Christians permit the having of two wives at the same time."§

This is the law of the gospel, binding on Christians, and to them it can be of no importance, except as a mere subject of information, to inquire whether or not polygamy is prohibited by the primary or the secondary precepts of the natural law, and is clearly reprobated by reason itself, or whether that of the Patriarchs took place by a dispensation of God, or if no such dispensation was given or ever was necessary, for, since the promulgation of the gospel, this law prohibits it to all who are, or ought to be Christians, and even to the Pagans or infidels also, as they are subject to the authority of Jesus Christ, who is the supreme lawgiver and sovereign of all men without distinction. If these last have had no chance to know his law, they may plead the excuse of invincible ignorance.

### *Of the Indissolubility of Marriage—of Divorce.*

To understand the doctrine of the church on the

---

\* St. Amb. lib. i, de Abraham, ch. vii. † St. Jerom. in Math. xix. ‡ St. Aug. de Nup. et Concu. Cap. X.

§ Ad Cons. Bulgar. Cap. LI. The fact that Luther gave the permission to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to marry two wives at the same time, is well authenticated. It is said that the Landgrave promised him the spoils of the monasteries as a consideration. See *Bossuet's History of the Variations, and Spalding's Hist. Ref.*



subject of the indissolubility of marriage, it is necessary to know that marriage may be regarded either as *true and legitimate*, as *ratified (ratum)*, and finally as *consummated*. That is a true and legitimate marriage which is annulled by no law; that is called ratified which is contracted by Christians, and that consummated, which use has perfected as a union. The bond in these has an increased degree of firmness and indissolubility, for a marriage between baptized persons, contracted according to the conditions established by the church, is confirmed, and therefore the tie is rendered much stronger than that between infidels or unbaptized persons; and when such ratified marriage has been made perfect by consummation its firmness is still more established.

1. It is held as certain, that a true legitimate marriage, contracted in infidelity, can be dissolved as to its bond, by the conversion of one of the parties to Christianity, if the other is not willing to live quietly with the Christian, and without contumely of the Creator. These words of St. Paul furnish a solid foundation for this belief: "But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord *commandeth* that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart that she *remain unmarried*, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife." The Apostle shows here the indissolubility of the bond of Christian marriages. He then continues: "For to the rest I speak, not the Lord, if any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him; let him not put her away. And if any woman hath a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her; let her not put away her husband." . . . . "But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace."\* Contrasting the marriages of believers with those made by unbelievers, in which one party afterwards becomes a Christian, he shows that

---

\* 1 Cor. vii: 10th and following:

the first are entirely indissoluble, but that the bond may be dissolved in the last. He requires the parties in the first, to either remain unmarried or to be reconciled with each other, but for the last, he says: "If the unbeliever depart, let him depart," and declares that "a brother or sister is not under a servitude in such cases," but is free. He evidently grants a privilege to the Christian party, and refers to the separation of the bond, and not to a mere separation as to habitation. The commentaries of different fathers, such as St. Ambrose and St. John Chrysostom, represent this to be the meaning of the Apostle. The decrees of Popes also establish the same. Pope Innocent III. says: "If one of unbelieving spouses be converted to the Catholic faith, and the other in no manner, or not without blasphemy of the divine name, or in order to lead him to mortal sin, willingly cohabits with him, he who is left, can if he pleases enter into second vows: and in this case we understand what the Apostle says: if he wishes to depart, let him depart; for a brother or sister is not subjected to servitude in such cases. For although true marriage exists among infidels, it is not however ratified (*ratum*)."\* And Benedict XIV. writes: "It is certain, that from a privilege in favour of faith, conceded by Christ the Lord, and promulgated by the Apostle, 1 Cor. vii, the marriage of unbelievers (*infidelium*) can be dissolved when one of the parties embraces the Christian faith; the other, obstinate in his infidelity, refusing to cohabit with the one converted, or being indeed willing to cohabit, but not without contumely of the creator,"† &c.

2. It is of faith, that a ratified marriage, which is not consummated, can be dissolved, if one of the parties makes a solemn profession by vow in some regular order, approved by the church. The Council of Trent declares: "If any one saith, that matrimony contracted, but not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn

\* Innocent III. de Divortiis, Cap. VII.  
Cap. 4, § 3.

† De Synod. Lib. VI.

profession of religion by one of the married parties; let him be anathema.”\* The Scriptures present nothing on this case, if we except the right given by the Saviour to leave father, mother, husband, or wife, for his sake,† but the authority and practice of the church establish it. The church, according to the power divinely bestowed upon her, makes it a condition, that, in Christian marriages not consummated, either of the parties, that shall choose, may be able to embrace the holier and more perfect state in religion by a solemn profession under vow. Therefore such contracts are, among Christians, entered into subject to this condition. The Greek church seems to hold the same even for marriages not only ratified but consummated.

3. The Catholic doctrine is, that a true, ratified and consummated marriage, cannot be dissolved as to its bond (*quoad vinculum*) in any case, or for any cause. Citing the words used by Adam under the inspiration of God: “they shall be two in one flesh,” the Saviour expressly announces the indissolubility of marriage, saying: “What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”‡ Thus he clearly declares that the bond is God’s work, and that it is not in man’s power to sever, or break it. When reminded that Moses allowed a bill of divorce, and asked why he allowed it? He replied: “Because Moses, by reason of the hardness of your heart, permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.” He therefore declares that from “the beginning” it was designed that marriage should be *indissoluble*. But much more it should be so, when made a sacrament by him, for its being a sacrament confers upon it a peculiar firmness and sanctity. He declares in St. Luke, that “every one that putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away, committeth adultery.”§ In this declaration he makes no exception. Both parties are in the

\* Sess. XXIV, Can. VI.  
§ Luke xvi. 18.

† Math. xix: 29.

‡ Math. xix. 6.

same case, and no distinction is made as to causes of separation. In St. Mark, he says: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery."\* Here also is the declaration universal, and includes all cases, without any distinction or exception. In St. Paul, we find the same clear and universal rule, that parties who are Christians, once married, cannot dissolve the bond of marriage, so as to be allowed to marry again. The woman, who leaves her husband, must remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband again. She is bound to her husband as long as he lives.† Wherefore the husband is also under the same law, as shown in the declaration of St. Paul, that "the husband hath not power over his own body; but the wife hath power."‡ "Who are we then," asks St. Augustine, "that we should say one is guilty of adultery who puts away his wife and marries another; and another who does the same is not guilty of adultery? for seeing the gospel says, *every one* commits adultery who does this, and consequently *all* who do it, that is whoever, putting away his wife, marries another, is guilty of adultery; without doubt both are included, both he, who, for any other cause besides fornication, puts away his wife, and he who puts her away for the cause of fornication."§ Here St. Augustine maintains, that no cause can exempt the case from this general law. Consequently, it is his opinion that the exception, made by the Saviour, as reported in the nineteenth chapter of St. Mathew, verse 9th, does not take the case from under the general law of the indissolubility of marriage among Christians. Jesus Christ declares: "And I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery." What is

---

\* Mark x. 11, 12.

† 1 Cor: vii.

‡ 1 Cor. vii. 4,

§ St. Aug. lib 1. de adult Conj, Cap. 9.



the proper meaning of these words: "except for fornication?" Does Jesus Christ declare that the bond of marriage may, for this cause, be dissolved, or only that, for this cause, the wife or husband may be abandoned as to community of life, but not as to the bond of marriage? The advocates of divorce, strictly so called, or divorce *a vinculo* of Christian marriages, assert that the exception allows the bond of marriage to be dissolved. The church maintains that this exception refers only to the right of separation, but does not give even to the innocent party the right of being free to marry another. This also is what St. Augustine declares. And thus understood, the text in St. Mathew, is in harmony with those we have cited from St. Mark, and St. Luke. It is in harmony with what these last have declared without exception, that we ought to interpret and understand the exception given by St. Mathew, for their texts are clear and express, while that of St. Mathew is somewhat ambiguous, by the manner in which the exception is thrown in. And what shows, that, even for the cause of fornication, the Saviour did not understand the marriage to be dissolved, is that he declares, that "whoever marries" the person "who is put away," even for this cause, "committeth adultery," which would not be the case, if the marriage with the first husband had been dissolved, since marriage is the union of two, and cannot be dissolved as to one and not as to both. The meaning of the exception therefore is, that to put away one's wife for any cause, "except for fornication," is to commit adultery by being thus the occasion of her committing this sin, and in case of her being guilty before he exposes her, then, for this crime, he has a right "to put her away," but in no case, has he a right to marry again, nor has she, when put away, the liberty to marry another as long as he lives, and any party who should marry her would commit adultery. The exception then only concerns separation, but does not affect the bond of the marriage which is indissoluble. This is the express teaching of the church: "If any one saith, that the church has erred, in that she hath taught, and doth

teach, in accordance with the evangelical and Apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties; and that both, or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other; and that he is guilty of adultery, who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband; let him be anathema."\*

It is of faith, that other causes, such as heresy, irksome cohabitation, or the affected absence of one of the parties, do not furnish a cause for dissolving marriage. "If any one saith, that on account of heresy, or irksome cohabitation, or the affected absence of one of the parties, the bond of matrimony can be dissolved; let him be anathema."† But it is also of faith, that the church, who does not admit that the bond can be dissolved, does not err when, for certain causes, she allows separation "from bed and board" for a determinate or indeterminate period. "If any one saith, that the church errs, in that she declares that, for many causes, a separation may take place between husband and wife, in regard of bed, or in regard of cohabitation, for a determinate or for an indeterminate period; let him be anathema."‡

A divorce *a vinculo*, of a valid and perfect marriage among Christians, can never be brought about except by the death of one of the parties. All that the civil authority can do, is to allow a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, and as to all the legal consequences of the marriage contract. If it allows its subjects to marry again, the other party divorced still living, it contravenes the law of God, and though it legalizes such unions in the eyes of those who do not regard the church as the teacher and interpreter of the law of God, it cannot change

\* Counc. Trent, Sess. XXIV. Can. V

† Ibid, Can. V.

‡ Ibid, Can. VIII.

the nature of these unions, which, before God and his church, are not valid marriages. Divorces of this sort are but a kind of Polygamy, and often cause more evils to families and to society, than would result from real Polygamy. The facility for divorce is a premium offered for crime; and the prospect of liberation from the bond, makes the married parties less solicitous to render the common yoke more tolerable and easy. Hence the more divorces that are granted, the greater the numbers that are seen to apply for them, and children are thus often abandoned by one or both of those who should fulfil towards them the offices of nature, and take care of their physical, mental, and moral education, while step-mothers are brought in to contemn and neglect them, for the sake of those who present more urgent claims of nature and interest. Society in general receives from this influence a degree of demoralization, which will continue to increase with the progress of its cause, just as the ancient civilization of Rome flourished, for six or seven centuries, when divorce was a thing unknown, and lapsed into the deepest corruption in proportion as it became frequent and fashionable.

#### *Of the Marriages of Slaves.*

And here we would take occasion to deplore the conduct of the civil government in this country, regarding the matrimonial contract of slaves, which, though the rulers profess Christianity, is completely ignored even as a civil contract, and left entirely to the caprice of owners, who frequently without scruple or hesitation, and for the sake of interest or gain, part man and wife, separate parents from their children, and treat the matrimonial union among them, as if it were really no more than the chance association of unreasoning animals. Often, also, some of these marriages are indissoluble by the sacramental bond, as well as by the original design of the Creator, and by the action of Christian proprietors and the neglect of a Christian

government, these separated parties are subjected to the temptation to form criminal and forbidden alliances, from which frequency, custom, and the condition of servitude, have removed in the public view, the shame and stigma which they possess before God, and according to the maxims of the Gospel. Christian proprietors will know and tolerate these alliances in their slaves, even when made without any formality, and where they are aware that one or both is under the obligation of other ties.

It is not certain, that the present dreadful calamities, which afflict the country, are not the scourge of God, chiefly for this sin, among the many that provoke his anger, in our people. He is not likely to leave long unpunished in a nation, the palpable and flagrant contempt of his holy laws, such as is evinced in this neglect or refusal to respect in slaves, the holiness, the unity, and the indissolubility of marriage. It would appear, that by the present convulsions, his Providence is preparing for them at least a recognition of those rights as immortal beings, which are required for the observance of the paramount laws of God. And if citizens desire to see the nation prosper and enjoy the blessing of God, let all unite to procure from the civil government, for the slaves, that their marriages be esteemed as God intends, and not be dealt with in future as they have been hitherto.

*Concerning those who Contract Marriage—The Impediments of Marriage.*

Those only are fit subjects to make the contract of marriage who are not affected by any of the impediments, which would render them incapable to make the contract licitly and validly. These impediments are of two kinds; some of which merely forbid marriage, and make it unlawful; under the circumstances but not invalid, while others annul it altogether, and cause it to be invalid. Impediments affect the persons, and suppose something wanting, or something present, which makes



them unfit to contract marriage. For instance, in the impediments of *error*, and of *violence* or *coaction*, the free consent is wanting, and in those of *order* and of *the bond* (ligamen), there is present another obligation unfitting the persons to contract, since in *order*, there is the sacred vow, and in *the bond*, there is the tie of marriage to another. Some impediments render the parties unfit to contract marriage only with certain persons, as *consanguinity* in certain degrees, and others make them unfit to contract with any person, as *real insanity*, or want of proper reason, and therefore want of ability to make a contract.\*

*Of the Power to Establish Impediments.*

Matrimony as an office of nature depends upon the will and consent of the contracting parties. But the parties being subject to the civil authority, must enter into such contracts subject to the civil laws, as far as concerns the legal effects of their marriage. The civil government or state has no legitimate authority to interfere with the natural contract, but it can make conditions upon which it will admit such contracts to be considered legal marriages, and adequate to confer civil rights upon the parties and their offspring. If the conditions which it prescribes be wanting, it may refuse to admit such marriages to be lawful. Its laws therefore may decree impediments which affect the marriage as to its public lawfulness and its civil consequences. But the natural contract which depends on the will of God

---

\* The following Latin verses show the impediments:

*Impediments which render void.*

Error, conditio, votum, cognatio, crimen  
 Cultus disparitas, vis, ordo, ligamen, honestas,  
 Amens, affinis, si clandestinus et impes,  
 Si mulier sit rapta, loco nec reddita into.  
 Hæc faciendâ vetant connubia, facta retractant.

*Impediments which forbid but do not annul.*

Ecclesiæ vetitum, tempus, sponsalia, votum  
 Impediunt fieri, permittunt juncta tenere.

expressed in the natural law, and the sacrament, which in marriages of Christians is to be regarded as inseparable from the natural contract, are subject only to the laws of God, and of his church to which He has given a divine authority for the salvation of souls. The authority of the church can only directly affect her members, or the baptized. For all the members of the church, her laws, requiring certain things as conditions to the validity of the marriage contract, and declaring such contracts null, without the prescribed conditions, are binding, and thus the members might possibly find themselves engaged in a true, sacramental marriage, which the civil authority might consider not lawful, or also in a legal marriage, which the church might esteem to be null, both as a contract and as a sacrament.\* In some countries, the rights of the civil and ecclesiastical power in respect to marriage, are the subject of controversy, but with us the state does not pretend to regulate what pertains to conscience, and its statutes are to be understood as regulating only civil effects and rights.

The church, however, every where, and at all times, has claimed to have "the power to determine all those things which can in any manner pertain" to the marriage of her children, and to judge matrimonial causes for them.†

The following canons of the Council of Trent, with respect to the power to impose impediments, and the right to judge matrimonial causes, show what is of faith: "If any one saith, that only those degrees of consanguinity and affinity, which are set down in Leviticus, can hinder Matrimony from being contracted, and dissolve it when contracted; and that the church cannot dispense in some of those degrees, or establish that others may hinder and dissolve it; let him be anathema."—*Sess. XXIV. Can. III.*

---

\* Thus the Emperor Justinian enacted a law making the marriage of cousins lawful, which Pope St. Gregory, in his rescript to St. Augustine or Austin, bishop of the Anglo-Saxons, declared unlawful. † Encycl. Pius IX., before cited.

“If any one saith, that the church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage; or that she has erred in establishing them; let him be anathema.”—*Ibid, Can. IV.*

“If any one saith, that matrimonial causes do not belong to ecclesiastical judges; let him be anathema.”—*Ibid, Can. XII.*

This doctrine follows from the very fact, that Jesus Christ has elevated matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament, and can only be logically impugned by those who deny that marriage is any more than a natural and civil contract. Spiritual things are not of the competence of lay tribunals. Jesus Christ himself has established the impediment of *the bond*, or *ligamen*, as we see in Math. xix, Mark x, Luke xvi, already cited. St. Paul refers to this impediment, saying: “Whilst her husband liveth, the woman is bound to the law.” Rom. vii: 2, and also in 1 Cor. vii: 10, 11, 12, where he also brings in the impediment of *disparity of religion*, see verses 13, 14, 15, regarding the freedom of the believer when the unbelieving party departs. This power Jesus Christ conferred upon the church, when he entrusted to her care his sacraments, to see that they should be administered for the good of the souls of the members of his church, and also when he gave a general power “to bind and to loose.”

Hence the church has ever claimed and used this power: “It is becoming,” writes St. Ignatius, “that spouses should enter into marriage according to the judgment of the bishop; by which their nuptials may be according to the Lord, and not according to cupidity.”\*

Justin Martyr, in his apology, terms those sinners according to the laws of the church who contracted certain marriages allowed by the imperial laws. And Tertullian says: “Therefore do we not marry heathens, lest we be led to idolatry, from which among them nuptials commence.”† He here shows already the custom

\* Ep. ad Polycarp.

† De Corona. Cap. 13.

of the impediment of disparity of religion, which afterwards was constituted an annulling impediment. St. Basil, who died in 379, in his epistle to Diodorus, speaking of one who had married the sister of his deceased wife declares, that he acted contrary "to the sanctions delivered by holy men," and that said person should part from her, before admission among the faithful. In the fourth century the Council of Elviris (or Elvira) decreed that matrimony cannot be contracted with infidels, and also within certain degrees of kindred.\* Pope Siricius, in his letter to Himerius, refers to the impediment of public honesty as established by ecclesiastical authority.† In the sixth century, the first Council of Orleans in 511, and the second in the same city in 533, have decrees respecting impediments. The acts of later councils, and decisions, or rescripts of different popes are cited to the same effect from the different centuries, but for our purpose these are more than sufficient. As St. Augustine declares: "The church of God neither approves, nor connives at, nor does any thing contrary to faith, or good morals,"‡ and therefore we feel assured, that her claims and action regarding matrimony are under the direction of the Holy Spirit, sent to be with her forever.

### *The Impediments which Annul Marriage.*

We will call attention to a few of these impediments which render marriage void and invalid, unless removed by dispensation, and which the faithful generally should know.

1. *Error* is when a person is married to one person thinking and intending to marry another. It is by natural law an impediment which makes such marriage null, for in it there is not such will and consent as is requisite.

2. The solemn *vow* of chastity, made by one who has received sacred orders, or made profession of religion

---

\* In Labbe Tom I, p. 972, year 305, Can. LXI. and LXV.L.

† In Labbe Tom. 2d, p. 1019. ‡ Letter CXIX.



in some order or community approved by the church. Such are incapable of contracting marriage, and, if they attempt to do so, the marriage is void and null by the law of the church.

3. *Cognatio*, or *kindred*, which may be natural, spiritual, or legal, that is by adoption, which last seldom occurs in this country, at least with the formality required to induce the impediment. Natural kindred is termed *consanguinity*, and results from persons being allied by descending from the same stock or issue. In the *oblique or transverse* line, it annuls marriage by ecclesiastical law to the fourth degree included, and it holds as well in illicit as in licit generation.\* In the direct line, it annuls in every degree, and, as is the most probable opinion, in the first degree by *the law of nature*.

4. *Spiritual kindred* is the relationship of certain persons by ecclesiastical law, contracted by means of baptism or confirmation. It prevents and annuls marriage between the person baptizing and the one baptized, and the parents of the baptized, and between the sponsors and the baptized, and the parents of the baptized, and the same for the confirmed where there are sponsors.

5. *Crime, crimen*, is the impediment arising from adultery, with a mutual promise of marriage in case the innocent spouse or party should die. It is sometimes attended with a machination to kill the innocent party, and even with the actual killing. This machination itself is an annulling impediment when the effect follows, and is perpetrated with the intention in both persons, and the promise of marriage either in the present or in the future, even though there be no adultery. But that adultery should be an annulling impediment: 1st. It must be accompanied with a promise of marriage after the death of the other spouse, and it matters not

---

\* To know the degree of consanguinity between two persons, the rule is to count the number of persons who are between them and the common stock; there are as many degrees as persons, the stock or head not included.

whether this promise preceded or followed the crime; 2dly. It must be a formal adultery, for if the one was ignorant that the other was married, it would not suffice for the impediment; 3dly. It must be a perfect act of adultery, as the law specifies. This impediment is placed by the law of the church to prevent crimes, by letting all persons know that in yielding to temptations to crime, they are placing more obstacles in their way.

6. *Disparity or difference of religion* is the prohibition to marry those of a different religion, and in its strict sense, it is a law annulling marriage between a member of the church and an infidel, or unbaptized person. If any member of the church enters into such a marriage, without a dispensation, the marriage is null and invalid. Even marriage with one not of the church, but who is baptized, is *unlawful*, though not for this invalid, if no other impediment annuls it. The church, who watches over the faith and eternal interests of her children, has established this impediment.

7. *Violence* is an impediment arising from a *coaction* which prevents the free consent of one or both of the parties. By natural law, such marriage is null. Freedom is indispensable to this contract.

8. *Public honesty*, is an impediment arising from absolute or valid espousals (*sponsalia*) or betrothal, for where a true promise of marriage is made to a person and accepted, *public honesty* induces a sort of relationship with the blood relations of such person, and if the promise or betrothal be broken off, annuls marriage with the relations of that person in the first degree,\* for a betrothal, but for a *ratified* marriage to the fourth degree included.

9. *Affinity*, is an impediment which arises from marriage, and causes one party to be allied to the blood relations of the other, so that after the death of the spouse, the survivor cannot marry reciprocally with any

---

\* By the old law, the impediment extended to other degrees, but it has been restricted to the first by the Council of Trent, when resulting from a betrothal broken.

of the relations of the other to the fourth degree. For the parties are by affinity allied to the relations of each other. The same affinity, annulling marriage to the second degree, results from illicit intercourse, and by such illicit act by one after marriage, the right to the *debitum matrimonii* is lost.

10. *Clandestinity*, is an impediment, which, wherever the decree of the Council of Trent on marriage has been published, annuls a marriage not contracted in presence of the parish priest, or of a priest approved for this by the bishop, or parish priest, and of two or three witnesses.

11. The *violent abduction* of a person from one place to another, for the purpose of entering into a marriage with such person, is by law made an impediment to such marriage, as long as such abducted person is not restored to a safe place, and is still in the power of the violent abductor. And this impediment exists as long as such person is in the abductor's power, even though afterwards willing to consent to marriage. The church requires the person to be entirely free, by being brought back and out of all restraint.

*Prohibitive impediments, but which do not annul.*

The impediments, which only render marriage unlawful and sinful, but do not make it invalid, and are called prohibitive, are four. 1st. *Promise of marriage to another*, called *espousals*—when made with proper formality; this makes marriage unlawful while still subsisting. 2d. *The sacred time*, for the Council of Trent “enjoins, that the ancient prohibitions of solemn nuptials be carefully observed by all, from the Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, until the day after Epiphany, and from Ashwednesday until the octave of Easter inclusively.”\* 3d. *The prohibition of the church*, whether by an interdict, or by a delay imposed by the ecclesiastical superior, in order to ascertain about impediments

---

\* Sess. XXIV. Ch. X.

or objections. *4th.* A simple vow of chastity, as of not marrying, or of receiving Holy Order, or becoming a religious. From such a vow the person who wishes to marry should have to obtain a dispensation.

These impediments are for the advantage of society and for the honour of religion, but however advantageous, there may exist circumstances and grave reasons for a dispensation from them in particular cases. The church exercises this power in regard to those impediments which have been created only by her own laws, while she never interferes with those founded on God's law. The law and custom of proclaiming the bans of marriage, are for the purpose of discovering if any impediments are in existence to prevent it.

We need not say anything about the necessity of marriage as designed by God from the beginning; and its necessity as a sacrament, or as a sign which gives grace to the parties, is manifest to all spiritually minded persons, who know how great is the responsibility of those who enter into the marriage state, and how much they stand in need of grace to live holily, and to sanctify their families. All are not obliged to enter into this state, for although a person does well who marries, he does better, who, for serving God, refrains from marriage, as the Apostle St. Paul expressly declares.\*

### *Of the Dispositions for Marriage.*

The Christian ought to be in the state of grace and friendship with God, when he receives the sacrament of marriage, upon which will depend, in a great measure, not only the peace and happiness of his after life, but perhaps even his destiny during eternity. He should, in making his choice, secure divine direction by prayer, and purify his intention: "House and riches," says the wise man, "are given by parents; but a prudent wife is properly from the Lord;"† and if a good wife be the gift of God, a good husband also must be the prepara-

---

\* 1 Cor. vii: 38.

† Proverbs xix: 14.



tion of his providence. God's intention in this institution ought to be the Christian's chief intention, since otherwise great disasters, like those of which we read in the book of Tobias, may befall him, for if he act like "those who so receive matrimony, as to shut out God from themselves and from their minds,"\* the devil will have power over him as he had over them. "Happy is the husband of a good wife: for the number of his years is double. A virtuous woman rejoiceth her husband, and shall fulfil the years of his life in peace. A good wife is a good portion, she shall be given in the portion of them that fear God, to a man for his good deeds. Rich or poor, if his heart is good, his countenance shall be cheerful at all times."† If such a wife be the portion of a man "who fears God," the woman who selects as husband a man that does not fear him, and cares not for the interests of eternity, perhaps is not herself of the number of those who make husbands happy, and who deserve to be called "a good portion." For Christians, in choosing the partners of life, the first and most important consideration should be *their salvation during eternity*, and therefore they should require the true faith, and the love and practice of the Christian virtues, as indispensable conditions in the persons whom they select. Beauty, personal qualities, family, position, wealth, may be minor considerations, and not sinful, but they should never be the first and chief inducements to a choice.

---

\* See Tobias ch. vi.

† Ecclesiasticus xxvi.

## CHAPTER XXV.

MAN IN THE FUTURE WORLD—HIS LAST END—DEATH—JUDGMENT—HEAVEN—HELL—THE RELATION OF THE LIVING TO THE DEPARTED—INVOCATION AND VENERATION OF SAINTS—RELICS—IMAGES—PURGATORY—PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

The Scriptures say to us: "In all thy works remember thy last end, and thou shalt never sin." Ecclesiasticus vii: 40. Four things concern the last end of man, Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell.

St. Paul teaches that death is the punishment of sin, "for the wages of sin is death." Rom. vi: 23. "But by the envy of the devil, death came into the world." Wisdom ii: 24. "Wherefore by one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned." Rom. v: 12. "Death," says St. Augustine, "is not a condition of nature, but a punishment of sin." Lib. de Prædest. et Grat. Cap. 3d. "But it is decreed for all men once to die." We are certain to die, but the time, manner, place and circumstances are all dreadfully uncertain.

But judgment follows death immediately: "It is appointed for all men once to die, and after death the judgment." This judgment, which follows death, is the immediate judgment of the soul without the body, and fixes its lot for eternity. It is called the particular judgment. "It is easy before God in the day of death to reward every one according to his ways." Ecclesiasticus xi: 28.

It is of faith, that at the end of the world the dead shall arise, and the bodies and souls shall again be united, and all shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ, who is "the judge of the living and the dead." "The Father hath given judgment to the son." John v: 22. "And he commanded us to preach and to testify that it is he who was appointed by God to be the

judge of the living and of the dead." Acts x: 42. "For we must all be manifested before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil." 2 Cor. v: 10. "And all nations shall be gathered together before him." Math. xxv: 32. This is the universal judgment.

But the lot of persons is decided at the particular judgment. "We believe that the souls of those who, after having received baptism, incur no stain whatever, and also those souls, who after having contracted the stain of sin are cleansed, either while in the bodies, or after being divested of their bodies, are immediately received into heaven." 2d Council of Lyons. To this the Council of Florence adds: "And they clearly behold God himself three and one as he is, however some more perfectly than others, according to the diversity of merits. . . . But the souls of those who die in mortal sin, or in original sin only, immediately descend to hell, to be punished however with unequal punishments."

To the just, who have preserved their baptismal innocence, or who have been purified from their sins before death, and who have nothing to expiate, the beatific vision of God is awarded immediately. They enjoy eternal life. To the just, not cleansed from lesser sins, or who have yet to expiate their sins by satisfaction, there is a purification in the future world.

Those who die guilty of mortal sin without repentance are condemned to hell, into which they descend forthwith, where they suffer the loss of God, and the pains of sense. It is of faith, that these punishments are as eternal as the happiness of the blessed. The common belief is, that hell is subterranean, and that the fires of hell are material, but these last points have not been expressly defined.

For the lot of those in hell who have been guilty of original sin only, see what we have said, page 146 and following.

With those who have descended to hell, the living

can hold no permitted relations. But with those in heaven, and those yet in the way of purification, we are held by "the bonds of the communion of saints." The first pray for us, and we can venerate them and invoke their intercession. The last we can benefit by our prayers and suffrages. We will briefly state the doctrine on these points.

*Of the Saints—We can Venerate and Invoke them—  
They Pray for the Living.*

The Council of Trent declares: "That the saints, who reign with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and help, for obtaining benefits from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour." To deny this doctrine, to say that it is foolish to supplicate the saints, or that they do not pray for men, or that it is against the Word of God, or idolatry, to invoke them, the Council condemns as impiety.

With respect to Relics of saints, the Council declares: "Also, that the bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ—which bodies were the living members of Christ and *the temples of the Holy Ghost*, and which are by him to be raised unto eternal life; and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which (bodies) many benefits are bestowed by God on men." The Council condemns those, who affirm that such honour and veneration are not due to the relics of saints, or say that such honour is useless, or that it is vain to visit places dedicated to their memories, with a view of obtaining their aid.

With respect to images, &c., the Council declares: "Moreover, the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in temples, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity or virtue, is believed to be in them, on account of which



they are to be worshipped; or that any thing is to be asked of them; or that trust is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which those images represent; in such wise that by the images we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ; and we venerate the saints who bear his similitude; as by decrees of Councils, and especially of the second Synod of Nice, has been defined against the opponents of images."—*Coun. Trent, Sess. XXV., on Invoc. of Saints.*

We here perceive what has been defined on these points. We see in the Scriptures that God will do for his friends, what he would not for others. He caused Abimelech to get Abraham to pray for him, and spared this king on account of Abraham's prayers. Gen. xx: 17. The angel sent to destroy Sodom spared the town of Segor at the prayers of Lot. Gen. xix: 21. He made Eliphaz and his two friends obtain the prayers of Job before he would pardon them. Job xlii: 8, 10. We see men and angels together invoked by Jacob in blessing the children of Joseph. Gen. xlviii: 15, 16.

God told Jeremias that not even did Moses and Samuel ask him would he grant his prayer and spare the people, showing he would do more if they prayed than for him. Jeremias xv: 1.

It is said that "whatever is written in the Scripture, is written for our instruction." But every where, in the Old Testament, we perceive the veneration and invocation of angels and living saints. The fact of saints being in the glory of God, increases their influence and their title to veneration. "The saints are like the Angels of God," our Saviour tells us, and we are told by St. John, that "the measure of an angel and a man is the same." Apoc. xxi. But angels know what takes place on earth, for "they rejoice when a sinner is converted," and the guardian angels of children know when those children are despised, for our Saviour gives this as a reason, saying, "their angels always see the face

of God." If angels seeing the face of God, can know what takes place concerning those over whom they watch, so can saints, seeing the face of God, know who prays to them. See Math. xvi. 10.

Nor does this detract from the sole mediatorship of Christ, because his is a mediatorship of redemption, theirs of intercession, and as theirs is through Christ, it rather enhances his than detracts from it. It is said, "For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," but the text shows what that mediatorship is; by adding: "who gave himself a redemption for all." 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. To undertake to apply the text without this addition is unfair. If living saints may pray for us, and not interfere with the mediatorship of Christ, why may not saints in heaven also do so? "Give honour to whom honour is due;" Rom. xiii. 7. Is no honour due to the saints who reign with Christ? And no invocation of those to be made who rule nations? Apoc. ii. 26.

To relics men have no objection, except when they have reference to the saints and friends of God. God chose to have the relics of his saints venerated. He caused the touch of the bones of Elizeus to restore the dead to life. 4. Kings, xiii. 21. "And God wrought by the hand of Paul more than common miracles. So that even there were brought from his body to the sick, handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the wicked spirits went out of them." Acts xix. 11, 12. Even the shadow of St. Peter cured the sick. Acts v. 15.

Persons sometimes cite God's commandment as prohibiting the making of images, and though it is general, they make and use all sorts of images, provided they are none of them religious. Whereas the church holds that God prohibits the making of images to adore them as Gods, but that we have at least as much right to use images as memorials of holy persons and scenes, as of those that are secular and profane, and that our veneration of the images, is to be referred to the prototypes, as is well understood by men. For example, observe the vene-

ration people have for the flag of their country, or for portraits of distinguished persons, or family portraits. Having little or no faith, they do not care much for the images of Christ, of his holy Mother, or his saints. Not so the church, of whose family they are.

*Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.*

The following shows the doctrine on this point: Whereas, the Catholic church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught, in sacred councils, and very recently in this œcumenical synod, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the Holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavour that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the holy Fathers and sacred councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and every where proclaimed by the faithful of Christ. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, be excluded from popular discourses before the uneducated multitude. In like manner such things as are uncertain, or which labour under an appearance of error, let them not allow to be made public and treated of. While those things which tend to a certain kind of curiosity, or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, let them prohibit as scandals and stumbling blocks of the faithful. But let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the faithful, who are living, to wit, the sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which have been wont to be performed by the faithful for the other faithful departed, be piously and devoutly performed, in accordance with the institutes of the church; and that whatever is due on their behalf, from endowments of testators, or in other way, be discharged, not in a perfunctory manner, but diligently and accurately, by the priests and ministers of the

church, and others who are bound to render this service." Counc. Trent, Sess. XXV. Decree on Purgatory.

"If any one saith, that, after the grace of justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world, *or in the next in Purgatory*, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to such sinner); let him be anathema." Sess. VI. Can. XXX.

"If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it profits only him who receives; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema." Sess. XXII. Can. III.

The Scriptures say: "He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Math. xii, 32. "For neither could it be truly said of some," writes St. Augustine, "that it would not be forgiven neither in this world nor in the world to come, unless there were those, to whom, although there should not be forgiveness in this world, yet there would be in the future." De Civit. Dei, lib. XXII. Cap. 24.

"If any man's work burns, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire." 1. Cor. iii, 15.

Of prayers for the dead. "It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins." 2d. Machabees XII. 46.

"What shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again? why are they then baptized for them?" 1 Cor. xv. 29. Whatever is meant by this passage, it at least shows that the Corinthians believed that the living could do something to benefit the dead, and some think that, by baptism for them, was meant, by metaphor, afflictions and penitential works.

The church has not defined where Purgatory is, but



it is the common opinion that it is subterranean. She has not defined that there is in Purgatory a material fire, which, however, is the most common opinion.

Of course, without a special revelation from God, no one can be certain whom He has sent to this place of expiation, or in what degree those in Purgatory are benefitted by the prayers of the living. As far as the doctrine has been defined by the church, no reasonable objection can be advanced against it, and to make it unpopular it has been necessary to misrepresent it, and blacken it by means of anecdotes, at once laughable and absurd. The descendants of those, who would admit no Purgatory formerly, and who were inexorable in denying venial sins, and the necessity of satisfactions, now maintain that there is nothing but Purgatory and temporal satisfactions or punishments for sin, so true it is that outside of the church men cannot be fixed in any belief, but "are cast to and fro with every wind of doctrine."

FINIS.

## ERRATA.

- Page 4 line 6. For Constantinopolitan, read Athanasian.  
" 61 " 4. For Multipld, read Multiplied.  
" 82 " 26. For Authority of the Church, read Authority  
of the Catholic Church.  
" 94 " 17 note. For Cotzen, read Contzen.  
" 152 " 8 and 11. For Sfrondatus, read Sfondratus.  
" 179 " 32. For Cease read Ceases.

# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

Of God—The Existence of God, p. 1. The Nature of God, 2. Unity, 3. Trinity, 3.

## CHAPTER II.

Of Creation—Angels, p. 9. Good Angels, 11. Demons, 13.

## CHAPTER III.

Of Man, p. 15. The Fall of Man, 18. Of the Unity of the Human Race, 20.

## CHAPTER IV.

Of Original Sin, p. 22.

## CHAPTER V.

The Merciful Promise of a Redeemer, p. 25.

## CHAPTER VI.

Jesus Christ—The Incarnation, p. 34. The Mother of God, or the Blessed Virgin, 38. The Redemption—The Cross, 40.

## CHAPTER VII.

Of the Holy Ghost, p. 44. He is a True Person, 45. His Divinity Proved, 47. He is Consubstantial with the Father and the Son, 48. The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, 50. His Gifts and Fruits, 53.

## CHAPTER VIII.

The Church of Jesus Christ, p. 55. Its Marks, Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity and Apostolicity, pp. 57-63. These Marks belong only to the Roman Catholic Church, 63.

## CHAPTER IX.

The Constitution of the Church—Its Hierarchy, p. 64. Its Infallibility, 66. Its Legislative and Coercive Authority, 69. The Pope the Visible Head of the Church, 70. The Necessity of the Church, or Out of the Church, no Salvation, 72. Its Members Not to Visit the Religious Assemblies of other Denominations, 74.

## CHAPTER X.

Of Holy Scripture and Tradition, p. 79. The Old Testament, 84. The New Testament, 87. Tradition, 91.

## CHAPTER XI.

Of Faith—The Rule of Faith, p. 98.

## CHAPTER XII.

Concerning Grace—Its Nature—Its Divisions, p. 103. Its Effects—First Effect, Justification, 108. Second Effect, the Merit of Good Works, 111. Predestination, 122. The Condemned Propositions of Jansenius, 129.

## CHAPTER XIII.

Of External Worship—Religion must be External and Corporal, as well as internal and Spiritual, pp. 130-133.

## CHAPTER XIV.

Of the Sacraments in General, p. 134.

## CHAPTER XV.

Of Baptism—Its Matter and Form, p. 146. Its Necessity, 146. Its Effects, 154. Its Minister, 155. Of the Mode of Baptism, 155. Its Ceremonies, 157.



## CHAPTER XVI.

Of Confirmation, p. 160. Its Matter and Form, 162. Its Effects, 164. Its Minister—Its Necessity—Its Subject, 165.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Of the Holy Eucharist—It is a Sacrament and a Sacrifice, p. 166. The Eucharist as a Sacrament, 167. The Real Presence, 169. Transubstantiation, 176. Other Points of the Doctrine, 181. Of the Matter and Form of the Eucharist, 182. Of the Minister, of the Subject, 184. Its Necessity—Its Effects, 185.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

The Eucharist as a Sacrifice, p. 186. The Body of Christ the Acceptable Victim of Sacrifice on the Cross and in the Eucharist, 187. The Mass—The Christian Religion has a Public Sacrifice, 188. Proofs that the Mass is a True Sacrifice, 190. Of the Matter and Form, 196. Its Effects or Properties, 197. Its Minister, 197. Of the Language in which it is Offered, 198. To Whom and for Whom it is Offered, 199.

## CHAPTER XIX.

Of the Sacrament of Penance, p. 200. Its Matter and Form, 202. Contrition, 203. Confession, 206. Satisfaction, 214. Absolution, 219. The Minister, 221.

## CHAPTER XX.

Of Indulgences, p. 224.

## CHAPTER XXI.

Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, p. 230. Its Matter and Form, 235. Its Effects, 237. Its Minister, 239. Its Subject, 240. Its Necessity, 241.

## CHAPTER XXII.

Of the Sacrament of Holy Order, p. 242. Order embraces different Degrees—It is a True Sacrament, 246. Of Deacons, 251. Of Priests, 253. Of Bishops, 254. Of the First Tonsure, 259. The Four Minor Orders, viz: of Porter, Lector, 260. Exorcist, Acolyte, 261. Of the Matter and Form, 264. Its Effects, 266. Its Minister, 271. Its Subject—Conditions Required, 272.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

Of Celibacy—It is an Obligation for the Clergy—It is a more Excellent and Holy State than that of Matrimony, 275–284.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

Of this Sacrament of Matrimony, p. 284. Of the Ends of Matrimony, 284. Of its Nature, 287. Matrimony is a True Sacrament, 290. Proofs of this, 292. Of this Matter, the Form, and the Minister of the Sacrament, 296. Of the Properties of Marriage, 304. Its Unity, 304. Its Indissolubility, and of Divorce, 306. Of the Marriages of Slaves, 313. Of the Subject, or of those who Contract Marriage, 314. The Impediments, 314. Of the Power to Establish Impediments, 315. Annuling Impediments, 318. Prohibitive Impediments, 321. Of the Dispositions for Receiving this Sacrament, 322.

## CHAPTER XXV.

Of Man in the Future World, p. 324. The Last End of Man—Death—Judgment—Heaven—Hell, 325. Of the Saints—Invocation—Veneration—They Pray for the Living, 326. Purgatory—Prayers for the Dead, 329.









